DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 272 PS 008 427

AUTHOR Stone, Arline N.
TITLE American Status of Early Childhood Education, School Year 1974-75.
PUB DATE 1 May 75
NOTE 201p.; Practicum report, submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for Doctor of Education degree, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Childhood Needs; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Attitudes; Educational Legislation; Educational Planning; Educational Research; Educational Trends; *Federal Programs; *Government Role; Handicapped Children; Kindergarten; *National Surveys; Program Descriptions; *State Programs; State Surveys

ABSTRACT

This survey of the status of early childhood education in the United States is based primarily on information obtained from the state departments of education in 49 states. The report includes: (1) consideration of current attitudes toward early childhood education; (2) a history of federal involvement in early childhood education; (3) information on important recent state legislation and activities of state child development offices; (4) descriptions of successful early childhood education programs in 13 states; (5) a review of the current status of kindergarten in 30 states; and (6) discussion of current issues and identification of current trends in early childhood education. (ED)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118272

12'75

AMERICAN STATUS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
SCHOOL YEAR 1974-75

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

Arline M. Stone

MAXI PRACTICUM

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Administration and Supervision
with a specialty
in
Early Childhood Education
at
NOVA UNIVERSITY

Approved: ....Marilyn Segal..........

....

Program Directors

..........6/7/75..........

Date

PS008427

American Status of Early Childhood Education
School Year 1974-75

by Arline M. Stone

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

Early Childhood Cluster
Dr. Glen P. Nimnicht

Maxi II Practicum Report
May 1, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD .... (ii)

ABSTRACT .... (iii)

INTRODUCTION 1

FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT OF ECE 13

WHAT STATES ARE DOING 27

STATE ACHIEVEMENTS 70

WHY KINDERGARTEN? 107

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION ISSUES 128

CURRENT TRENDS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION 145

SUMMARY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION 172

APPENDIX A - Directory of Early Childhood Education Services 177

BIBLIOGRAPHY 184

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank John F. Aguire, Principal, Hialeah Junior High School, for his understanding, cooperation, and kindness to me during the entire Nova Doctoral Program.

I am indebted to Mildred S. Comstock, for her constant support in all areas as I labored on this project, and in particular her expertise as a master English teacher.

I am thankful to God; without his grace this report would not have been completed.

FOREWORD

I have presented this report factually rather than analytically because of its uniqueness and the enormity of the project.

The method I followed was to send a letter requesting information on early childhood education directed to the Commissioners of the State Departments of Education. Since the level of information varied among the 50 states, often I had to request additional data or direct more letters to a newly designated person.

I tabulated the data as it arrived and read it before deciding how to arrange it. Subsequently, the material suggested the logical order of the report.

This study is limited to the degree that adjunctive programs may be in effect in various states or because one respondent (Connecticut) did not reply; since I could not get equal responses from all states, I am unable to assume the report is complete regarding every aspect of ECE. The report is valuable to the reader as an appraisal of national developments in early childhood education.

ABSTRACT

This project is a survey of Early Childhood Education in the United States to determine if the number of children being served is increasing or stabilizing; if there has been a change in funding on federal, state, and local levels; the kinds of services and frequency renderings; new components of Early Childhood Education within the last two to three years, and a review of new laws and regulations pertaining to needs and rights of children through age eight.

INTRODUCTION

"Today's Child, Tomorrow's Promise" capsules the spirit behind Education--a dual spirit of hope and commitment. The hope is that every child living and each one yet to be born in the United States will have the opportunities he needs to develop to his full potential. This is not a new idea. For many years, people have entertained similar sayings, such as "Just as the twig is bent so is the tree inclined."

What is new about today's child is that children are beginning to be regarded as more than the sole responsibility of their parents and families. The well being of children, and thus the future of our country, is a responsibility shared by all of us.

In our society, a young child must be regarded as a worthy individual deserving of value and respect for what he is. The democratic ideal of individual worth cannot attain its full meaning unless it is equally extended to the young as well as to the more mature citizens of our society. A prime program focus on the nature of the child he is today--his characteristics, his interests, and his needs--is necessary, and his education should enable him to live successfully and to foster mechanisms which will enable him to cope with situations as they develop.

The beginning years of life are critical for a child's intellectual growth, and for his social, emotional, physical and motivational development. The first five years are the formative years, the years in which permanent foundations are laid for a child's feelings of self-worth, his sense of self-respect, his motivation, his initiative and his ability to learn and achieve.

The emphasis on child development also stems from the growing realization that everything impinging on the life of the small child affects what happens to him when he grows up. During the years when a child's body, intellect and psyche are developing most rapidly, his conditions of life will profoundly influence his later health, motivations, intelligence, self-image, and relations to other people.

Studies show dramatically that the first eight years of a child's development have life-long impact on his personality structure--his attitude towards learning, his abilities, and his socio-emotional development. There is evidence that these characteristics are stabilized during the early years; this possibie early stabilization may account for the difficulty some children have in later school life. Early detection and correction of learning disorders, therefore, are necessary.

Early Childhood Education is really for children 0-8 years of age but the frequency of programs is focusing on three to eight years of age. However, a few states distinguish between Early Childhood Development and Early Childhood Education, in that development is a term which encompasses health, nutrition, family, culture, environment, and intellectual growth, while Early Childhood Education is the program and curriculum for children ages three through eight (nursery school, preschool, kindergarten, and primary grades one through three).

The education and the nature of the child require that early childhood development be relevant to the child, the emotional climate be sound, and that the total child development approach be used. Children do not develop separately in components of intellectual, social, emotional and physical development. These four developmental aspects are closely interrelated, and a program which neglects one over the other will tend to be an unbalanced one and, therefore, will be ineffective in producing a fully functioning personality.

Educational leaders are now expanding their concern to cover not only preschool children from poverty families, but youngsters from every socio-economic level throughout the United States. "Nothing is more central to the problem of equal educational opportunity than the experiences children have - or do not have - during the early childhood years," said the U.S. Senate's Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity in its report issued December 31, 1972. The opportunities and the environments that America's 21-million children under age six are now experiencing--

are among the major determinants of their future success or failure.

The growing public awareness of children's needs is reflected by the White House Conference on Children, which began in 1909, and the establishment of the Federal Government's Children's Bureau in 1912. The United Nations in 1959 issued the Declaration of Children's Rights and was followed in 1969 by the Bill of Rights of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children. The promises made for children have still not been fulfilled in 1975, but much has been accomplished.

For handicapping, early childhood education appears to have good potential, but here again there is a dearth of longitudinal research. Total change of environment very early in life from institutional care to family living does have an outstanding impact upon the ultimate productivity of the adults.

Ultimately, whether the program is kindergarten, Head Start, day care, parent intervention, nursery school, preschool, etc., the question of economics emerges. Even if it is demonstrated that young children can learn a skill in advance of its normal appearance, we still must decide whether it is desirable and appropriate. The crucial question is if such learning is reasonably economical in terms of time, effort and money; and if it ultimately helps children in terms of their education and career in an ever changing complex world. It is this last criteria that few proponents of early programmings have contemplated. If one develops programs that are rote in nature and stress social conformity, is one adequately preparing individuals for living most of their productive lives in the next century?

Since the midsixties we have had an unprecedented interest in early education. Development of educational programs for the young was founded on the premise that a major avenue for combating the ugly cycle of poverty was through education. For the first time the American conscience seemed to become acutely agitated that segments of our population -- the American Indian, the Appalachian white, the Mexican-American, the Black, and the ghetto populations made up of various races and ethnic groups--were not fully participating in our affluent society. Thus, massive federal legislation was enacted to support programs for young children from low income families.

There are good reasons why expanded early childhood education and day care should come in part from the federal government and why the responsibility for its administration should be lodged with the states. Unless our national effort in these areas is perceived as a federal responsibility, there is less likelihood that a comprehensive approach can be developed.

The efforts of Head Start, parent child centers, research and development centers, the National Laboratory on Early Childhood, have provided information to the professional and lay public regarding the capacity of the young child to learn, and regarding the impact of early learning experiences on the full development of the child's potentials.

Attention has been directed to helping the child develop a positive self-concept, motivation to learn, adequate social skills, emotional stability, and physical well being. Other important concerns have been the determination of the critical stages for the presentation of learnings, the important content to be learned, the most effective strategies for teaching the child, the effectiveness of various educational delivery systems, the stability of learning, measurement or evaluation of relevant variables.

Another movement which has furthered early education and day care is that of women's liberation. Demands from this group to make provisions for their children while they are engaged in the world of work have been loud and clear. Closely allied with these demands are those from mothers who have been forced to join the job market because of divorce status. Since divorce is accelerating, and more mothers are forced to go to work, the need for child care has become an ever increasing problem. In addition, it is often necessary that both parents work to cope with the rising costs of living. At the same time, these parents want adequate care and stimulation for their young children when they are on the job.

As of January 5, 1975, Title XX amending Title IV-A of the Social Security Act has passed the Congress. In the final version of the Social Security amendments reported out of the Conference Committee and passed by each house, these items are of importance:

1. Eligibility is decided by income rather than past, present or potential welfare status. Provisions allow for free services for families with less than 80-percent of the median family income of the state and sliding fee scales for families making from 80-percent to 115-percent of the median family income.
2. Staff-child ratios are set at 1:15 for school-age children under nine, 1:20 for children ages 10 to 14; ratios for preschool children remain the same as specified in the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.
3. Work bonus provisions originally attached to the bill in the Senate were deleted.
4. States must have new State Plans approved by the federal government, reflecting the changes passed in this bill, by October 1, 1975, when the new amendments become effective for

program operation.

Child development can be viewed as falling generally into three categories:

1. Comprehensive child development programs which embrace all or nearly all the needs of a growing child and his family - educational, nutritional and health - plus involvement of parents through instruction in the fundamentals of child development and family counseling.
2. Developmental day care which is designed to enable mothers of young children to work and to provide their children with an opportunity for social and educational development. It involves trained people working with children, availability of books and toys, meals meeting nutritional requirements and some medical care.
3. Custodial day care which involves little more than ensuring the supervision and physical safety of children while their mothers are at work. People in charge usually have little or

no training in child development; there are few books or educational toys; and entertainment is generally provided by a television set.

The kind of child care that professionals generally regard as most feasible is developmental day care. This approach attempts to meet the wide range of physical, emotional, social, and intellectual needs of each child within the framework of a protective environment. Its prime characteristic is a warm, accepting climate in which an educational thread links all of the program components. This type program should provide a bright, stimulating environment designed to accomodate a variety of activities; a multiplicity of interesting equipment, toys and materials geared to the specific developmental stages of preschool children; a well thought-out curriculum, agreed on by staff and parents; a wide range of supportive services ministering to the social, medical, psychological and nutritional needs of growing children; and an experienced, competent staff trained in the precepts of child development and deployed in a manner which encourages continuing child-adult interaction.

Educationally, a good development child care program should help a child learn to trust adults; should enable him to feel comfortable and secure, and should instill in him confidence in himself as a beginning learner.

In all instances, information sources for reports based on what is happening in Early Childhood Education in individual states come essentially from documents received from that state; see the bibliography.

FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT OF ECE

Early childhood education received additional support on January 5, 1975, when President Ford signed Title XX of the Social Security Act to provide free social services for 600,000 children under age six.

Two major indicators of the growing national involvement in early childhood education are the ever-increasing enrollment rates in preprimary programs and the growth of federal funding for early childhood development. The number of children enrolled in preprimary programs increased by 1.1 million in the eight-year period from 1965-73, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics. The total preprimary enrollment of children three to five years old in 1973 was 3.2 million with five year olds comprising the majority (2.6 million). The next highest enrollment rate was for four year olds, with 1.1 million enrolled. Of the three year olds, 535,000 were enrolled. Since 1960, the number of licensed day care facilities has tripled and the number of children in other preschool programs has doubled. It is anticipated that by 1980 the number of preschool children in the United States will increase by 3-million, to reach an all time high of 28-million. Kindergarten and nursery school enrollment is likely to reach 6.3-million by that date.

In spite of academic debates and funding setbacks, an inexorable trend toward universal early education and/or day care for young children continues to grow. Ronal K. Parker and Jane Knitzer in their booklet, "Day Care & Preschool Services: Trends & Issues", estimate that it will take 6.8-million personnel to accomodate all the children involved. At present there are about 250,000 people working in Early Childhood Education. "Developing a network of child care services essentially means developing a new corps of human service personnel with career lines and patterns for both professionals and para-professionals."

Federal legislation has created seven agencies to provide for Early Childhood Education. These national programs are available throughout the country, and are administered at the state level.

In addition to these, there are some 90 model programs that have been developed across the United States for early education of the handicapped, with supporting funds coming from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Of the 90 programs, 73 are currently demonstration programs and 17 are outreach programs. The model programs are funded by the Bureau of Education for a period of three years, during which time they are demonstration projects and coordinate their efforts with other agencies. At the end of the three year period, the financing is taken over by another agency and the program is continued. This agency is usually a public school. A small number of the projects have been continued for a fourth year to disseminate information, and these are referred to as outreach programs.

Recently Abts Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, was funded by the National Center for Educational Communications and the Division of Research of the Bureau of Education of the federal government to disseminate information about exemplary projects the federal government has funded. Eight of the 18 exemplary programs selected were from the 90 model programs for the education of the handicapped. The eight selected are:

UNISTAPS/Model Preprimary Center for Hearing
Impaired Children, 0-6, and their families
St. Paul, Minnesota

A Model Preschool Program for Mentally Retarded,
Seriously Disturbed, and Speech Impaired
Handicapped Children in Southwest Arkansas
Magnolia, Arkansas

A Home Approach to the Early Education of Multiple
Handicapped Children in a Rural Area
Portage, Wisconsin

Developing Language and Perceptual Skills in Preschool and Early Education Periods
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

A Model Preschool Center for Handicapped Children,
with Professional Training, Research, and Service
Components
Seattle, Washington

Preschool Project for Developmentally Handicapped
Children
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

A Community Model for Developmental Therapy and
Neighborhood Follow-Through
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Precise Early Education of Children with Handicaps
(PEECH)
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

All of these model programs include parent involvement as a major component. While special education has at least given lip service to the importance of parent involvement for many years, Head Start has undoubtedly had an influence on the breadth and degree of parent involvement demonstrated in the First Chance Programs.

Responding to the personnel needs for child care programs, the Office of Child Development began in 1970 to plan for a new program. The plan was based on the assumption that numbers alone would offer no solution. Thus, responding to the dual challenges of increasing the supply of competent staff members for early childhood programs and, at the same time enhancing the quality of child care services, the Office of Child Development created a new concept for training professional staff in the field of child care--that of the Child Development Associate (CDA).

The basic purpose of the program is to promote a system of training and credentialing for individuals working with preschool children and for those planning to enter the field. The specific goals are to:

1. Upgrade the quality of programs for children and provide them with maximum opportunity for growth and development.
2. Increase the supply of competent child care personnel.
3. Develop innovative and flexible competency-based training programs with heavy emphasis on center-based field training.
4. Establish the Child Development Associate as a recognized and vital resource within the field of human service occupations.
5. Encourage and provide opportunities for training for staff members (including para-professionals) seeking to become CDA's.
6. Establish a competency-based assessment and credentialing system to grant professional recognition to the CDA.

The key feature of the project is that, unlike the traditional approach to professional training, the credential of the CDA will not be based solely on courses taken, academic credits earned or degrees awarded (although credits and degrees will have their place in the training programs). Credentials for the CDA will be based upon careful evaluation of each candidate's demonstrated competency to assume primary responsibility for the education and development of a group of young children.

In the spring of 1973, the Office of Child Development funded 13 pilot training programs to prepare trainees to acquire these competencies. Programs are unique in their organizational patterns and approaches to training; however, all training programs provide:

- Training geared toward acquisition of the CDA competencies
- Academic and field work as a set of coordinated experiences
- A minimum of 50-percent field training
- Individualized training geared to the strength and weakness of each trainee
- Flexible scheduling which will allow each trainee to complete the training within a range of time necessary for his acquisition of competencies
- Willingness to work closely with the CDA

Consortium.

The 13 pilot training projects are sponsored by universities, colleges, junior and community colleges, and private nonprofit training groups. Eligibility for training is open to anyone interested in pursuing a career in child care, who has reached the age of 17, and can meet local health requirements. Trainees are participating in these pilot programs:

Fall River CDA Council
Fall River, Massachusetts

A coordinated effort among the Head Start program, the public schools and Mental Health Association working toward a statewide pattern of transferable college credits for trainees.

The Teachers, Inc.
New York, New York

Sponsored by a private, nonprofit training organization in conjunction with a bachelor's degree program of Antioch College. Trainees are being prepared to work in preschool programs that serve innercity Black and Spanish speaking communities.

California State College
California, Pennsylvania

Conducted by the college and the Head Start State Training Office. CDA's return to the Head Start centers in which they were employed and establish classes for another much larger group of trainees.

Allen University
Columbia, South Carolina

Allen University is a predominately Black institution where the training program features open enrollment, particularly for adults with limited prior education, and a high percentage of financial support for trainees in the form of college work study, release time, stipends, and scholarships.

Bemidji State College Child Development Training Program
Bemidji, Minnesota

The college trains persons employed in early childhood centers including four Indian centers in rural Minnesota. Training is on the campus, in licensed early childhood centers, and in a mobile learning unit staffed by a field trainer and including curriculum materials for trainee self-observation and analysis.

Eastern Oklahoma State College
Wilburton, Oklahoma

Coordinated with the State Office of Education, the State Vocational Technical Office, the State Office of Children's Services and other universities, this program offers a series of "minimesters," courses of one week each. After each minimester, trainees have two weeks of intensive practical experience. The curriculum leaves open the opportunity to acquire an Associate Degree.

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

The University is training a corps of early childhood personnel to effectively function in ethnically diverse communities, exhibiting bilingual/bicultural knowledge and skills. Sites for field training are in Head Start centers, private nursery schools, and public school kindergartens with children of ethnically diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Honolulu Community College and University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

The College and University are cooperatively sponsoring a statewide CDA program for Head Start employees. College credit for training is granted by the Community College, with provisions made for transfer credit to the University of Hawaii.

Idaho Consortium
Boise, Idaho

The project is sponsored by a consortium of state agencies, higher-education institutions, and public schools. The aim is to implement CDA training in institutions throughout the state. Programs at three colleges and universities provide the equivalent of a two-year college program. National Youth Corps students assist in trainees' classrooms while they attend classes.

Erikson Institute for Early Childhood Education
Chicago, Illinois

The eight Offices of Indian Child Services and the Erikson Institute are training child care staff on Indian reservations throughout the United States. A specialist from each Office of Indian Child Services is participating with Erikson Institute staff to train CDA candidates. A major thrust of the project is to involve Indian communities in designing a training program that reflects their values, beliefs, and tribal customs.

Community College of Philadelphia
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

A cooperative effort of three agencies: an urban community college, a public school system, and a non-profit laboratory for research and development. Trainees are aides in the Philadelphia School District's early childhood programs. Training is coordinated through the College. Research for Better Schools assists in curriculum design and the development of instructional materials.

Forest Park Community and Junior College
St. Louis, Missouri

Many resources in St. Louis are incorporated in this project which includes linkages to the St. Louis Association for the Education of Young Children; Head Start; Model Cities; Washington University; Central Institute for the Deaf; The Learning Center; The Miriam School for Learning Disabilities; the public schools; United Fund Day Care Centers, and private nursery schools. CDA trainees spend half of their time in a preschool program in St. Louis and half in academic experience.

Community College of Denver
Denver, Colorado

The Community College focuses on training employed child care workers, with an individualized plan designed for each. Pairs of trainees work together to plan, implement, and evaluate training activities. The project staff collects and prepares individual study units and coordinates activities at the training sites.

All 13 pilot training projects were in operation in 1974; in addition, there is a Head Start Supplementary Training (HSST) Program for approximately 5,000 Head Start classroom staff who are training in 350 participating institutions. The HSST programs are using the Child Development Associate approach and are emphasizing competency-based training during the school year 1974-75.

Again, the question of whether we should have preschool and day care programs funded at the federal level seems to have been largely answered by the increase in such programs all over the country. With the soaring enrollments in nursery schools and kindergartens, this nation must continue to face the issue of how to provide quality services for our children. The country must find answers to a question posed by Edward Zigler when he headed HEW's Office of Child Development: "Are we going to provide the children of this nation with development child care, or are we merely going to provide them with babysitting?"

WHAT STATES ARE DOING

Important Legislation

At least nine state legislatures took action in their 1974 sessions toward creating state mechanisms for planning and coordinating services for young children and their families.

Tennessee enacted a bill establishing an Office of Child Development in the governor's office, and the new legislation grants the OCD broad authority for comprehensive child development programs for children under six and for coordinating services for children over six years of age. It provides for a system of local and regional child development councils and a state advisory committee and makes provision for an early childhood development personnel training program.

The Minnesota Legislature appropriated $250,000 for the establishment of at least six early childhood pilot programs to be sponsored by local school districts in 1974-75. The emphasis is on preventive services for prekindergarten children and their parents.

The North Carolina Legislature enacted a bill "to establish equal educational opportunities in the public schools" (S.B. 1238). Although the legislation is directed primarily to programs and services for the handicapped, a broad interpretation would include child development programs.

Maryland, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Arizona introduced legislation and met with varying success.

In 1972 the Georgia General Assembly voted funds in the amount of $1.9-million to set up an Early Childhood Development program on a pilot basis. The program was aimed toward the disadvantaged and the mentally and physically handicapped children from birth through five years of age. The program provided testing, diagnosis and treatment of mentally and physically handicapped from 0-2 years; educational classroom experiences for mentally and physically handicapped children between the ages of three and four, and a kindergarten program for children five years of age.

Forty-five school systems received grants from this fund and are operating an ECE program. During 1973 a total of 3,915 children were served and 2,056 of them were housed in educational classrooms. This number represented 739 three and four-year-old children and 1,317 five-year-old-children.

An extension of the existing ECE program was voted by the 1973 session of the Georgia General Assembly. Funds in the amount of $6.7 million were voted for two purposes: to refund the 1972-73 existing pilot program and to extend services to five-year-old children who are physically, mentally, and emotionally handicapped.

The 44 systems participating in the ECE program were refunded at this current operating level, $43,000, to maintain the 1973 program of three components:

1. testing, diagnosis, and treatment of children less than three-years of age who have physical or mental handicaps
2. educational program for mentally, physically, and emotionally handicapped children ages three and four

3. educational programs for disadvantaged children five-years of age.

Funds alloted to these 44 school systems for continuation of the program were in the amount of $1,892,000. It is proposed that a total of 2,156 children will be served by Components 1, 2, and 3.

The balance of $4.8 million was divised on a parity basis among all other systems for a kindergarten program (designated Component 4) for mentally, physically and emotionally handicapped children. One hundred and-fifty-four-systems (including the original 44) received funds to establish an ECE Program for handicapped children. It is proposed to serve 5,000 in this program.

An abstract of the legislation for Preschool Education sets forth a one-half day basis for a 180-day school year to serve (1) all children who have attained age five, and (2) three and four-year-old children who are either physically, mentally or emotionally handicapped or perceptually or linguistically deficient. The State of Georgia feels that the principal responsibility for developmental skills of young children lies with the parents and that the purpose of this program is to supplement the resources which parents have available to meet the distinctive mental, physical, and emotional needs of their children. In acknowledgement of this policy, enrollment of children into the preschool program is on a voluntary basis, except in those school districts which by law now require attendance in a public preschool program.

The Florida legislation expresses the intent that ECE be restructured to more fully meet the unique needs of each pupil. Intent is further expressed that each pupil shall obtain a level of competency in the basic skills sufficient to continue future educational success by the time he leave the Early Childhood Program. To carry out this purpose, the Act (CSSB 96) requires that beginning with the 1976-77 school year, each school district shall include in its comprehensive educational plan a plan for ECE programs. In developing the plan, the School Board is required to seek direct community, parent, teacher, and school administrator involvement. The Act further provides that any child who is six years old before January 1 of the school year shall be admitted to the first grade at anytime during the school year.

Another major bill passed by the 1974 Florida Legislature emphasizing young children is Senate Bill 277, which provides for the promulgation of statewide minimum child care licensing standards,which will take effect July 1, 1975.

In Illinois in 1972, the passage of House Bills 322 and 323, caused the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to look closely at the early childhood education picture in Illinois. As a result, OSPI allocated $100,000 of Title VI money for one year ($10,000 per site) to ten early childhood sites in Illinois. These communities had gone above and beyond the mandate of the law by implementing preschool programs in the 1972-73 school year rather than using that year only as a planning time period. All the sites except one are in special education districts.

The criteria for eligibility: "Three-and-four-year-old children who displayed significant delays in their development to the extent that any early education program in the community could not be expected to sufficiently meet their needs in preparation for future kindergarten enrollment" (Early Childhood Intervention in Illinois, Division of Supervision and Instruction, March, 1974).

The Iowa General Assembly, 1974 Session, passed a new licensing law and appropriated $500,000 for day care centers to acquire or improve physical facilities to house the center, and to acquire recreational or educational equipment or supplies. Outside of a few Head Start programs, or where preschools were combined with day care centers, these schools did not qualify for funds because a center was defined as serving six or more children for more than four hours.

Iowa now has (January, 1975) new permissive legislation which allows local school districts to provide pre-kindergarten programs and receive educational foundation aid for these programs. But the State Legislature is concerned as to the cost factor and undoubtedly will pass legislation to restrict the program to some degree. However, early childhood aged children needing special education are now eligible on a weighted formula for such a program in the public schools.

New legislation was passed by the Massachusetts State Legislature which provided education for all children ages 3-21, who are educationally handicapped. Effective September 1, 1974, the law guarantees to every child in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the right to a free and public education regardless of handicaps. A child with "special needs" is a school-age child who has been determined by the Core Evaluation Team to be a child with special needs because of temporary or more permanent adjustment difficulties or attributes arising from intellectual, sensory, emotional or physical factors, or specific learning disabilities, who is unable to progress effectively in regular education and requires special education. The new law provides for a whole range of optional programs to meet the needs of these youngsters. Integration into regular classes with extra services is only one of these options. Provision for legitimate absenteeism is made by utilizing visiting teachers.

In Massachusetts school committees must provide screening for children who are three and four years of age. If, after screening and evaluation, the child is found to need special services, a delivery plan for these services will be developed. A plan may include one or more of the following: 1) home program; 2) group day program; 3) family day care program; 4) residential program.

Wisconsin does not have a state plan or definition of Early Childhood Education. Presently an Ad Hoc Citizens Committee composed of day care providers, parents and agency personnel is meeting to develop a plan for coordinating child care/children services within the state. However, they did pass new legislation in 1973 affecting young children. Chapter 90, Section 448.121.02 requires that "each school district shall operate a kindergarten program in which all five year old children of the district may be enrolled. The teachers shall be certificated by the Department to teach kindergarten."

A second new law, Chapter 90, Section 442, known as the Special Educational Needs Program was established to assist pupils who have low levels of academic achievement especially in relation to social and economic factors. Priority is given to preschool and primary elementary grade children. There were 32 programs, totaling $3,112,900, funded during the 1973-75 biennium.

A third piece of legislation (Chapter 89) mandates all school districts to provide educational programs for children with Exceptional Educational Needs beginning at age three. These children are evaluated by a multi-disciplinary team. The statute also provides that a school district may provide educational programs for children, birth to age three, who have exceptional needs. The Department of Public Instruction is now responsible for the supervision of the education program for exceptional children in all state or county residential facilities.

A new thrust in teacher education in Wisconsin has been the Child Care Diploma and Associate Degree programs offered through the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education. Teachers of university, college and technical institute programs in ECE meet together as the Wisconsin Early Childhood

Teacher Educators Association.

Texas, in July, 1972, at the request of the Governor, during the second called session of the 62nd Legislature, appropriated funds to the Texas Department of Community Affairs for early childhood development during fiscal year 1973. One of their specific tasks was to prepare a long-range, coordinated, statewide plan for young children in Texas. It was recognized that all agencies currently providing services to young children must be involved in preparing such a state plan. Accordingly, the Interagency Health and Human Resources Council established a Committee on Early Childhood Development, whose principal purpose was to work on the preparation of the plan. The committee was formed in November, 1972, with the Director of the Office of Early Childhood Development as its Chairman. As of December, 1974, there is an Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education, created by the 63rd Legislature in House Bill 91, with members appointed by the Governor.

Effective December, 1973, Colorado passed a law requiring a license for any person caring for or placing for care one or more unrelated children in a location outside the child's home. This license must be obtained in accordance with the Child Care Act. The Colorado State Department of Social Services issued Minimum Rules & Regulations for Child Care Centers effective August, 1973. The regulations cover large and small day care centers, and infant and toddler nurseries, and include the legal base, authority, definitions, types of licenses, and penalty prescribed by law. New legislation regarding young children's rights is pending, but it is uncertain as to the final outcome for the year 1975.

The State Department of Education in Louisiana has jurisdiction over nursery schools and kindergartens that are part of an elementary or secondary school or institutions of higher education. They also have a Section Chief in ECE at the state level. While there has been no change in funding patterns in the past two or three years on the federal level or state and local agencies, Louisiana does have new laws and regulations pertaining to the needs and rights of the handicapped children who need special education.

New Mexico State Legislature in 1974 adopted a new formula for state funding of public schools which is in effect for the first time in the 1974-75 school year. The effect of this new formula is to provide more equal funding for all school districts regardless of local wealth. Age for entering first grade was also changed in the 1974 Legislature. Previously the law stated that a child would be six years of age by January 1, in order to enter first grade that year. The law now reads that a child will be six by September 1, in order to enter first grade. It is expected that this shift will take place gradually over the next few years in conjunction with the phasing in of kindergartens.

The 1974 Legislature in House Bill 85 passed a bill which mandates that a state supported Early Childhood program (K-3) must be available to every age eligible child by the beginning of school year 1977-78. New Mexico is currently in a phase-in period whereby they are increasing yearly the proportion of children to whom state funded kindergarten programs are available. In 1975 New Mexico is serving about forty-percent of the state's eligible children in public school programs. Approximately half of these children are in state funded programs while the remainder are in programs funded by federal monies. The largest number of the federal programs are funded by Title I with a sizable amount of money going into the programs with large numbers of Indian children.

The State Board of Education on June 21, 1974, adopted regulations for pre-elementary programs established by local school boards for development of children who have not attained the age at which they are subject to the provisions of the Compulsory School Attendance Law (six years of age). In order to insure that ECE programs are available to students in all districts by the 1977-78 school year, the State Board established dates for age-eligibility to be used by local education agencies beginning with the 1974-75 school year.

There were other advances made in ECE around the country: in Virginia there is a mandate that kindergarten must be offered by all divisions by September, 1976. Nebraska has a new law that makes it mandatory for all districts to take care of all Special Education students at district expense -- to be refunded by the State at ninety-percent of the expense. In Kentucky the 1974 Legislature amended the school laws to require that instruction be offered to every child of compulsory school age. This applies mainly to children who have been excused from regular attendance at school due to mental or physical disabilities. With the school year 1975-76, the State of Kentucky anticipates going under a new formula for the distribution of state funds to the local districts (Weighted Pupil Program).

The New Jersey State Legislature presently (1975) has in committee a bill to lower the legal school age from five to three. In November, 1973, the New Jersey populus approved by referendum the funding of at least five regional day centers for the handicapped throughout the state at a cost of twenty-five million dollars. In the 1973-74 school year the New Jersey State Legislature provided a half million dollars to carry on work with preschool handicapped. In the school year 1974-75, the state legislature has provided one million dollars for the support of preschool programs.

In Maine they passed a law (L.D. 965) insuring equal educational opportunities for all handicapped children beginning at age five. Local school districts must make a concerted search for these children and place them in school, with "mainstreaming" whenever possible. Up to 1975 some physically handicapped children were excluded from school and only home teacher services were provided. The provisions of the law will become mandatory with the 1975-76 school year. At present, local education agencies are developing and training the Pupil Evaluation Teams required by the statute.

The only change of funding in the last two or three years on the state and local levels results from the passage of "L.D. 1994" which applies to public education. Its purpose is to provide that no more than fifty percent of the cost of public education be derived from the local property tax. The statute is designed to equalize educational opportunity throughout the state. The result may be that more local schools may inaugurate kindergarten programs.

In October, 1974, the Department of Public Instruction of Delaware issued their bulletin regarding "Activities in Early Childhood Education for Delaware - 1974-75." Following are two topics of concern:

1. Comprehensive Legislation has been introduced that would provide preschool and nursery school programs, and is being studied by legislators and a task force of concerned professionals from public and private agencies. If the legislation is passed over the objection of private owners of preschools, preschools would be subject to state control for the first time.

2. No agency in Delaware now coordinates services to young children. In general, services in the urban, northern section of the state are available but the rural, southern portion of the state is lacking in comprehensive services. During 1974-75, the Technical Assistance Development System of the University of North Carolina will assist Delaware with this problem.

In accordance with House Bill 474, enacted by the 77th Session of the Missouri Legislature and signed by the Governor on August 1, 1973, every child is guaranteed the right to an education that is appropriate to his developmental needs. To assist the schools in identifying the needs of children at an early age, a task force was established by the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to develop guidelines for early childhood screening in Missouri.

The 1974 Legislature appropriated $1,155,469 to the South Carolina Department of Education for the support of child development programs for the 1974-76 school year. Additional funding for these programs will be provided through school lunch programs and USDA commodities; local resources (public clinics, mental health clinics, civic clubs, etc.), and a sliding fee scale or a flat rate for parents who are able to pay for the program for their children.

In Pennsylvania the funding for this age population is the same for the current school year (1974) $100,000,000. It has always been high. There are three basic conditions that apply to the children: 1) Prior to school entry, all children must be immunized against rubella, diphtheria, polio and measles; 2) All children regardless of condition must be provided with a free public education and have equal rights with the non-handicapped child; 3) All kindergarten children may be transported to and from school with the same reimbursement as elementary children.

Child Development Offices

Some of the significant early childhood programs now in progress throughout various states will unquestionably provide valuable future direction for the implementation of new methods.

In the year 1975, State Offices of Child Development, (OCD's) through the National Association of State Directors of Child Development, have taken the lead in working for an increased state role in coordinating the delivery of services for very young children and their families. Over the last three to four years some seventeen states have set up Offices of Child Development with several more anticipated within the next three years (1975-77). An indicator that the action is shifting to the states came recently with a"statement of concerns" developed by the National Association of State Directors and directed to the federal OCD office and HEW officials. In its statement were listed five areas of concern:

1. The question of programs funded directly by the federal OCD that would bypass the states and thereby defeat state efforts to effect coordination of services.
2. A request that states have the opportunity for input in planning at the federal level.
3. The need for improved communication and coordination between the Washington OCD and its ten regional offices.
4. The desirability of the selection of a permanent director for the federal OCD.
5. The need for more effective communication and understanding between the federal OCD and state OCD's.

This statement resulted from a September 1974 session involving state, national, and regional OCD staff members. A positive response for improved communication was evidenced in the appointment of a Washington OCD staff member to act as liason with the state directors.

Definite guidelines are evolving from the ECE programs and services are being created to conform to these guidelines.

The Arkansas Office of Early Childhood Planning set up a training task force in 1973, and they designed an ETV series, "About Children," -- a child development course which is reaching more than a thousand people, some of whom are taking it for graduate and undergraduate credit. The planning is divided into three sections:

1. About Children: An Assessment of the Needs of Young Children in Arkansas from Birth to Eight Years of Age
2. The Directory of Services
3. The State Comprehensive Plan

The Office of Early Childhood Planning further submitted an application for a foundation grant to develop an extensive educational television course on parenting which might be used statewide by a network of educational television stations. Beginning in the fall of 1974, OECP presented a series of sixteen 30-minute programs on parenting, which ran for a semester and will be repeated the second semester with credit being given both times. During this time a second set of programs, for wider distribution if funded, would be developed. The use of educational television for adult education has not been fully explored and college deans are discussing other courses. However, they do plan on offering parent training as an additional course.

In 1974 the Arkansas Department of Education published a Services Directory entitled "About Children." It was coordinated by the Office of Early Childhood Planning, and the study was funded, in part, by the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services and by a grant from the Governor's Emergency Fund.

The primary purpose of the 104-page directory is to help the residents to locate the services and programs which are available for young children and to identify someone at the state level to contact in case a parent or interested person cannot locate the service locally. A second purpose of the directory is to make it possible to check what is offered in a local community against what is available elsewhere and thereby identify the gaps that exist. It is possible to build a statewide coordinated effort which will extend and enlarge those services for a greater number of children so that the future can be a better one for young children in Arkansas.

The State Board of Education in Alabama, at their meeting on January 8, 1973, accepted in their statement of educational philosophy, the responsibility of educating their children under six years of age. To meet this need, they initiated a plan which provides:

1. Establishment of schools for five year olds and assumes responsibility for the educational aspects of their programs.
2. Private schools for children under six years of age to have the opportunity of being accredited by the State Department of Education.
3. Responsibility of the State Department of Education for the approval of all educational institutions providing teacher education programs in the field of ECE, and for certification of all teachers in all programs for children under six.
4. The State Department to develop a guide for evaluating programs for training of paraprofessionals in ECE.
5. Parent education an integral part of ECE and

needed in the field; the state to devise standards for programs for parent education.

6. A staff sufficient in quantity and quality to be employed to offer services in:
    a. coordination of ECE section staff and all ECE services within the State Department of Education
    b. consultant and guidance services in teacher education, paraprofessional training, parent education
    c. consultant and guidance services to private and church-related ECE programs.
7. Standards for curriculum development and their evaluation to be developed by the State Department of Education.

With the inception of federally and locally funded programs, the movement toward the use of teacher aides in programs for young children has become widespread in the schools of Alabama. In 1974 the Division of Instruction, Montgomery, Alabama, issued Bulletin No. 3, entitled "Alabama Early Childhood Education: Teacher Aide Guide," setting forth a) criteria for selection,

b) statement on policies, c) interpersonal relationships within school settings, d) skills - talents, e) inservice, f) evaluation, and an appendix which includes application forms, suggested topics for inservice study, and evaluation forms.

The ECE program in California was launched when the State's Legislature and the Governor approved Senate Bill 1302 in 1972. The program was developed and sponsored by the State Board of Education and involved 172,073 children in 1973-74 -- its first year of operation. A total of 1,010 schools in 800 school districts -- eighty-percent of all school districts in the state -- participated in the program. Each school was charged with meeting the requirements of the legislation, including:

- Local development. The program must be developed at the local level to meet the assessed needs of particular communities. The design of the program is the responsibility of the principal and his staff, working with parents and other interested members of the community.

- Parent participation. Parents must be involved in all stages of planning, approval and implementation of the program at the local level. Parents and other adults will participate in classroom activities to help achieve the 10:1 pupil/adult ratio.
- Individualized instruction. As the key objective of the ECE program, individualized instruction will require a new look not only at the teacher's role, but at time, space, materials and well trained people. It will also dictate the physical rearrangement of classroom space to include learning centers.
- Diagnosis of a child's needs. In an attempt to consider the whole child, the act requires that schools diagnose the child's needs in the areas of what he should be learning at a given stage in his education, what his parents want him to achieve, and his physical condition and nutritional needs.

An attempt by California to become the front-runner among the states in providing comprehensive early childhood education has scored a victory and met rebuffs. The restructuring of educational programs for California students in grades K-3 attempts to take a giant step toward making the first eight years of a child's life the most important.

In 1972, the OCD in the State of Idaho was directed to conduct an exhaustive study of the needs of their children by Governor Cecil Andrus. The results are identified in the report, "Growing Up in Idaho: The Needs of Young Children." The first survey was designed to identify existing services and resources to children and families in the state. The second survey was a prenatal, perinatal and postnatal study (fifty-percent of the obstetricians and pediatricians were interviewed as well as twenty-five-percent of the general practitioners, and maternal and child records in ninety-percent of the hospitals in Idaho). A third study randomly sampled two-percent of the families in Idaho with children under six. As a result of the needs surveys, the Office of Child Development went on record as follows:

1. That the state and local communities initiate an all-out campaign to enhance responsible parenthood.
2. That the state expand the early periodic screening program to include all children 0-6. This program provides a comprehensive screening, checking for common problems in the areas of medical, visual, auditory, dental, nutritional, social, intellectual, and physical development.
3. That the state develop multidisciplinary programs for "high-risk" children (ages 0-6) that are primarily home-based, with the program administered by child development centers in conjunction with early periodic screening.
4. That the early periodic screening diagnosis and treatment results be tabulated so that gaps in services be identified and that these gaps be made public so that support can be generated for their elimination.
5. That a human resources development and needs assessment agency be created in state government to continually monitor needs and to

develop programs to meet these needs.

The State of Idaho, through its Office of Child Development is seriously involved in its pursuit of the needs of children 0-6 years of age. Their objective is to carry the torch of equality through social changes allowing for full moral and mental development of Idaho's children -- albeit they do not see the need for public school education at this time.

One other report issued this year by the OCD is "The Status of Minority Children In Idaho 1974," Volume III. Its purpose is to compare the status of children from families of racial and cultural minorities with children from the general population. The minority groups were the Mexican-American, American Indiana, and the Blacks. Seven recommendations were made in order to promote the health and welfare of the minority children in Idaho. None included an early childhood program in public schools. The pressing need is clearly for better housing conditions, availability of Community Health Clinics, and inclusion of minority children in Head Start programs.

The State of North Carolina has an Office of Child Development and is funded primarily from funds by the Applachian Regional Commission. The Commission's support has published a compilation of needs and services entitled, "The State of Young Children in North Carolina - 1974" (124 pages). The information covers by counties, number of children by ages, population projection, health needs, number of handicapped children under six, and the number of children served by available services, e.g., licensed day care, Head Start, special programs for handicapped children. It is expected the publication will be useful to determine needs and priorities for each area, thereby eliminating much of the basic survey tasks.

The Office of Child Development is funded to conduct planning, coordination, administration of child development funds, and evaluation for child development programs in North Carolina. The Office is the coordinating mechanism to promote interest in ECE by insuring that available resources (local, state, and federal) are known and made use of by local groups which are interested in initiating quality services to children.

The Office uncovers and eliminates gaps and duplications of effort to bring about a more effective service to children and their families.

A bound report re "Child Care in Appalachian North Carolina: A Regional Approach" was prepared by the Office of Child Development (1975) for the purpose of presenting their model as an approach to the delivery of child care services through a regional mechanism. Maps illustrate the location of the regional service delivery area and the number of its facilities and provides totals of children served by county and by region. One chapter is devoted to an approved approach to staff training; another to a home visitor program and the recognition that the home is the most influential factor in the development of a child.

Community cooperation can bring more and better health, education and social services to families. To show how that idea works, the Texas Department of Community Affairs' Office of Early Childhood Development, gave funds in 1973 for community projects covering a three-year demonstration period. By the close of 1974, the communities had studied the conditions of their children under six years of age and set up programs which they considered most crucial. Many of the projects used all or a portion of their funds for matching with Title IV-A money through the State Department of Public Welfare. As a result, more than 1250 children are enrolled in child care programs; another 1500 have been screened for health problems; and approximately 50,000 family members are being served indirectly. In the Texas panhandle (26 counties) have begun generating community support for child care programs and providing funds and technical assistance to child care centers. The project is using funds from a federal manpower grant and the Office of Early Childhood Development.

A Governor's task force and a legislative committee, conducting independent inquiries into institutional child care in Texas, have come out strongly for prevention of children's problems in 1974. The Task Force urges that a comprehensive appraisal program be extended to all children to detect potential problems in health, nutrition, development, and learning.

The Committee on Early Childhood Development, which is made up of representatives of state agencies which provide children's services, completed a first draft of the "State Plan" in August, 1973. On June 26, 1974, the Committee presented the plan to the Interagency Health and Human Resources Council, the Governor's chief advisory body on human resource matters made up of the heads of state agencies.

The Office of Early Childhood Development is also interested in the concept of a trained professional who can demonstrate the ability to work well with children ages 3-5, and has funded a two-year pilot program on this subject. The Federal Office of Child Development set up several CDA training sites through the nation -- Texas created its own sites, and will be among the first states to have this new profession of child care giver. Some 220 candidates are being trained in Texas at seven colleges. Many of the candidates are expected to complete training in May, 1975. One of the primary accomplishments of the Texas CDA program will be a curriculum that schools and other educational programs can use to train child care givers.

Because the state is so large, the Texas Department of Community Affairs' Office of Early Childhood Development is experimenting with a regional approach to planning and coordinating early childhood development programs. To that end, the Office (1974) contracted to employ two regional early childhood development coordinators. The Office is collecting statistics on income, employment, families with female heads of households, families with children under six, and other characteristics on the 500 Texas cities and all 254 counties.

There are several new reports from the Office of Early Childhood Development:

a. "The Darker Side of Childhood: 46 Things You Need to Know About Texas Children" -- a collection of bold facts about the needs of children. The title was adapted from a line in Governor Dolph Briscoe's speech to the Early Childhood Task Force of the Education Commission of The States, when he referred to "a darker side of childhood" for some Texas children.

b. "Your Child: Smoothing The Way to Kindergarten" a guide for parents to help their children make the change from home to school.

c. "Texans' Concerns For Young Children" -- a reprint of a summary report of the views expressed by 850 Texans attending regional forums on early childhood development in 1973.

d. "Meeting The Needs of Young Texans" -- about the value of a preventive approach to children's problems; also an outline of the proposed statewide planning process for meeting children's needs.

Other news regarding what happened for young children in Texas in 1974 is:

The Coordinator of Migrant Affairs, created within the Texas Department of Community Affairs' Office of Early Childhood Development, was made a division of the Governor's Office by Executive Order in April, 1974. The Coordinator's role is to see that more migrant families receive needed services.

The State Coordinating Committee on Early Childhood Development, invited representatives of eighty organizations concerned with the quality of life for children to Austin, November 14-15, 1974, to look into the possibility of forming a council of children's organizations. A constitutional committee was appointed to draw up bylaws.

The statewide organization of Child Care '76, held its first state convention on August 15-16, 1974. The delegates voted to establish a nonprofit organization to lobby on behalf of legislation promoting children's interests.

Other program developments include an Office of Child Development grant to the University of Arizona whereby this will be the first year to provide televised cognitive instruction for Papago Native American Children. The coordinator of the program feels that the first year's efforts were successful in influencing the development of cognitive skills when presented via television.

In 1974, an Early Childhood Education Specialist was added to the staff in the Arizona Department of Education, and the Governor's appointed 21-member Advisory Committee has held statewide hearings in each of the six planning districts in an attempt to assess the unmet needs of the children in Arizona. A series of reports are being prepared for presentation to the Governor and Legislature through the Department of Economic Security based on testimony given at the hearings.

Through an Inter-governmental Personnel Act, 1970, a proposed plan for the establishment of an Oklahoma State Office of Early Childhood Development was completed August 31, 1973. It was financed by the Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. It covers services, programs and activities relating to the total development of all children from 0-6 years of age regardless of social or economic status. However, the program has not been implemented because studies are still underway.

The State of Utah issued their Annual Report - Fiscal Year 1974, under the State Board of Education and the State Office of Child Development. There are 99-members on the Advisory Council; ten on the Youth Advisory Council, headed by the Director and a Program

Committee of 13. The Office was funded to begin in June of 1973, and the Director assumed her duties in October of that year. The OCD has made a concerted effort to identify parent training programs across the state. These are sponsored by the Board of Education. Many areas have established toy lending libraries.

The State Board of Education in Utah plans to offer the assistance of its Public Relations Department in promoting a campaign of publicity for the Office. This will include feature story releases to the newspapers and documentary information for release on television. In addition the OCD will utilize every possible source available in the dissemination effort for the coming year: brochures, pamphlets, and flyers; displays and exhibits; and a newsletter to be published quarterly.

The OCD has been instrumental in the work done for the State Board of Higher Education in accrediting Early Childhood programs in the colleges and universities. One of the recommendations is the inclusion of classes teaching prospective child development and early education people to work with handicapped and minority pre-schoolers, within programs that work with other agencies in the communities and with parents.

A Head Start State Training Officer serves as a technical assistant to programs throughout the state. The officer is assigned specifically to work with the colleges, universities and Head Start programs in Utah. The main objective is to assist the colleges and universities to set up and provide competency-based training for paraprofessionals working in Head Start. This same competency-based training will be offered to day care providers as required by the new standards.

While considerable progress has been made in the Utah State Office of Child Development, the staff is small, and it will not be possible to fully implement all of the goals and objectives of the Planning Committee without the addition of necessary personnel. It is presently staffed with a Director, Head Start Training Officer, a Head Start Handicapped Specialist, and a Supplementary Training Associate Specialist.

Services for children 0-8 years of age are shared responsibilities among four state agencies in Minnesota.

They have legislation that makes it mandatory for districts to provide kindergarten to children aged five, and legislation has been passed that gives a half-unit of state aid on a permissive basis to children with special education needs beginning at birth.

In April, 1972, the Maryland State Board of Education declared early childhood education to be of high priority and assigned the State Department of Education to prepare guidelines for the development of ECE programs. The guidelines were published September, 1973, and the manual is to be reviewed every five years by the Maryland Early Childhood Education Committee and revised as needed. It contains: a) the importance of ECE; b) the goals of ECE; c) family and community involvement; d) factors to be considered in planning an ECE program including roles, facilities, and equipment for adults in the early childhood program.

In Maine the Department of Educational and Cultural Services has responsibility for children five years of age and older. Nursery school programs and day care centers are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health and Welfare's Division of Social Services.

Inasmuch as public school have never traditionally served preschool children, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Illinois, made 1972-73 a year of planning, program development, and preparatory activities so that the local districts could develop exemplary preschool programs. During 1973, OSPI sent Early Childhood Special Education survey forms to every school district in the state. The information obtained from the surveys is being studied to assist OSPI in identifying the status of early childhood special education in Illinois in order to plan for future needs.

The identification techniques used in the survey enabled 23,876 pre-kindergarten children to be enrolled in screening during the following year; 4,077 were identified as needing additional services after the screening process. This figure comprises approximately eighteen-percent of the total number of children screened.

In New York, the Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education handles the business of ECE. At the present time (1975) New York State's primary involvement in early childhood education is the Experimental Prekindergarten Program managed by this Bureau. The program serves 7,000 children and their families in 54 school districts at a cost to the state of $10.6 million. The program for prekindergarten is designed to improve learning opportunities for children whose homes and neighborhoods provide inferior environments for optimal growth and development. An additional group of nearly 4,000 children attend prekindergartens funded by Title I, ESEA. These proposals are reviewed and approved by the State Education Department.

The Bureau of Child Development published an eight page "Guidelines for New York State Experimental Prekindergarten Program - 1974-75" citing the purposes for early childhood programs: 1) to explore the possibilities of having prekindergarten programs operated by public schools, and 2) to determine the impact developmental prekindergarten programs could have on kindergarten and early elementary grades. Although the program was planned for children from disadvantaged areas, there continues to be provision for socio-economic mix. A statewide evaluation design will be developed during this fiscal year. Implementation will begin in 1975-76.

The Region VIII Office of Child Development has selected South Dakota to receive a $55,000 grant to establish an Office of Child Care and Development. This was announced March, 1975. The office will be established in the Division of Human Development, Department of Social Services. Present plans include a needs survey, technical assistance and the development of resources for services for children.

STATE ACHIEVEMENTS

In the year 1975 there are some excellent programs and plans underway all across the country for children 0-8 years of age, and it appears that the states can really get it together. There is evidence that some states are doing it. In spite of funding cutbacks at the federal level there are many successful projects and programs that have received endorsement at the federal and state level and have been found to be exportable to other school districts. Since there are no absolute answers as to what kind of education is best for children and their parents, a variety of approaches and learning situations are offered, and results indicate some states are steadily moving ahead in meeting the needs of the very young population in the United States, through specific programs and concrete plans that will be implemented next year or the following year.

Alaska

There are many programs in early childhood education in the State of Alaska. There are 35 Head Start programs. Most of these are in the rural areas since the greatest incidence of economic and culturally disadvantaged exists in the small villages.

Fairbanks was selected as the site for the Home Start demonstration project -- this program is funded and supervised by the Office of Child Development. Follow Through is another compensatory program and the University of Arizona has been federally contracted to supervise Alaska's program.

The Centers for Children With Special Needs (mental and/or physical handicaps) are sponsored in whole or in part by the State Department of Education, State Department of Health and Social Services, or Alaska Crippled Children and Adults, Inc. The administration may be through the local school or a private nonprofit agency. While the centers are strategically located throughout the state, evidence is growing to indicate there will be an increase of local programs for these children.

Other early childhood programs are the Parent Cooperative Programs, Correspondence Studies, and Alaska

State-Operated Schools (ASOS). The Parent Cooperative Centers are designed to foster early child development with maximum parent participation. Parents are required to devote a specified amount of time working directly with the children in the classroom under the supervision of a certified teacher. All of these programs are privately administered and funded, but they are jointly licensed by the State Department of Education and the Department of Health and Social Services.

For the child who lives in isolated areas where no school facility exists, the State Department of Education sponsors correspondence studies. The curriculum designs cover the required subject areas -- including kindergarten through grade three, and periodic workshops are held for the parents who teach their children at home. Early childhood education is strongly encouraged by making available to the parents information, materials, and technical assistance especially designed for the young child.

There are 15 early childhood programs conducted in rural areas, and they are known as "ASOS." The programs are funded by Title I, ESEA, and they are similar to that of Headstart.

Arkansas

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, funded through the U.S. Office of Education, is a program of compensatory education to help educationally deprived children. In Arkansas there has been an increasing emphasis on preventive education in the early grades as a means of reducing remedial problems later on. In 1973 a total of 55,192 children were served in Title I elementary programs in Arkansas. Of that number 2,487 were in early childhood programs; 1,333 were in kindergarten; 12,846 children were served in the elementary remedial program; 3,645 were in the program for the handicapped, and 30,561 boys and girls were in the reading program. Title I involvement in kindergartens in 1973 consisted of extending half-day programs into full day sessions. A total of $620,915 was spent on early childhood programs and $24,655,585 was expended in the Title I program.

The Follow Through program is a research and development program which carries Head Start type programs into the public schools. Four Arkansas school districts have centers for children in grades one to three and each employs a specific program model. The Parent Educator Model (developed at the University of Florida) is used at Jonesboro, Arkansas. The Individually Prescribed Instruction Model from the University of Pittsburg is used in Texarkana, and the Pulaski County Special School District employs the nongraded Hampton Institute Model. The Engelmann-Becker (Distar) Model is in operation at Flippin, Arkansas. Aides are included in all classrooms and a wide range of medical, dental, and counseling services are included. Funds expended in the 1973 school year total $1,080,040 and served 1,250 students five to eight years of age.

The United States Office of Education provides funds for services to migrant children in the Arkansas Public Schools. The Migrant Section of the Federal Programs Division of the State Education Department administers the funds. Special attention is given to development of the language arts and reading; speaking and writing in both English and Spanish are emphasized. A child who has moved across state or district boundaries within a state with his family in order to pursue agricultural or related food processing activities may qualify for services under the Migrant Education Program. An estimated 900 children ages six to eight years of age were served in 1972 at a cost of $110,000. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by P.L. 89-750 provided the program funds.

There is a national school lunch program in Arkansas. The program serves every district but two. In 1972 daily noon meals were provided by 1,278 schools to 311,684 children. Breakfast was served in 250 schools to 22,225 children. The programs are funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to the Department of Education and they in turn reimburse the schools. The total cost of the program in Arkansas in 1973 was $15,135,761.

The State of Arkansas has a School for The Blind offering a complete educational program for kindergarten children. Visually handicapped children who meet the usually accepted definition of blindness are eligible to attend. A school term of 190 classroom days is operated between August 15 and July 15 annually. There is no tuition; no charge is made to students for room, board, laundry, textbooks, and ordinary medical services. Elementary school subjects are taught with emphasis on vocational choice and training. A program for the development of personal living skills (elementary) has been in effect for the last several years. The School has an "A" rating from the State Department of Education and is accredited by the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped. A special program is operated for visually impaired children with compound handicaps. Seven preschool children were in kindergarten or the deaf-blind program during the 1973 school year. The per capita cost was $5,000 per pupil.

The School for the Deaf offers a complete education program for children from kindergarten through grade three. Deaf children who meet the criteria of a 60 decibel hearing loss and whose parents are residents of the State are eligible for the school. The term runs on a ten month schedule from August 15 to June 15. There are no charges to the student for tuition, room, board, textbooks, and ordinary medical services. There is a $7.50 registration fee and the student provides his own clothing and personal articles. The school is accredited by the Conference of American Instructors for the Deaf. Twenty-two pupils were in kindergarten in 1973. The approximately cost per pupil is $6,000 per year.

The Service Directory - 1974, Arkansas Department of Education, Office of Early Childhood Planning, shows an enrollment of 13,913 boys and girls in kindergarten, and 26,680 children served by Title I, ESEA, Follow Through program.

California

The early childhood program in California is new, and it has been designed to be phased into all elementary schools over a period of years. In its first year of operation (1973-74), 12-percent of the kindergarten and grades one, two, and three population were to participate in the program. Twenty-four million dollars was allocated to 1,010 Early Childhood Education schools. A total of $130 was allocated for each participant, with additional funds made available for disadvantaged pupils. Some of the Early Childhood Schools were funded only with ECE monies, and others were multifunded with other state and federal funds.

The legislative mandate for the early childhood education program required an emphasis in the evaluation each year on the degree to which the program is implemented. The implementation for 1973-74 was obtained from three sources. Firstly, each participating school submitted a school-level plan. Each plan was reviewed and independently rated by at least two team members; the average of the ratings was converted to a standard score. From December, 1973, through March, 1974, the Early Childhood Education schools were visited by the Department of Education's early childhood education program audit teams, and the reports of these teams comprised the second source of program implementation data. A third evaluation procedure was a report due from each school in December, 1973, and April, 1974 with the final evaluation report due July, 1974. Determination of eligibility for expansion funds for 1974-75 was based on the ranking of schools -- using each of the three sources of information.

In the reading/language development component, the achievement test scores showed an average gain of 1.1 months of growth per month of instruction in grades one through three. A total of 134,470 students were tested. A variety of methods to evaluate the effectiveness of language development programs was reported by ECE schools. The use of two or more standardized tests either used alone or with locally developed criterion-referenced tests was reported by more than 50-percent of the schools.

In the mathematics component, the achievement test scores showed an average gain of 1.2 months of growth per month of instruction in grades one through three. A total of 122,611 students in kindergarten and grades one, two, and three were tested. A variety of procedures were used for evaluating the mathematics program. Norm-referenced standardized tests and locally developed criterion tests were used in more than two-thirds of the ECE schools.

There was also the parent participation and community involvement component, and the activities that were most effective were parent-teacher conferences, advisory committee meetings, school parent meetings, use of parent volunteers, and home communication. In the early childhood education program, use of parents in the classroom was reported as one of the measurable major objectives. Other assessments were made by: a) parental visits to the classroom, b) the number of parental assistants recruited, c) the increase in attendance at school activities, and d) amount of parental involvement in planning, implementation, and evaluation.

In summary, the new California ECE program includes:

1. Organization, Curriculum, and Instruction
2. Parent Education
3. Parent Participation
4. Health and Social Services
5. Staff Development and Inservice Education.

Colorado

Pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education in 1973, the Colorado Department of Education sponsored a sophisticated, colorful manual entitled "Developing Training Support Systems for Home Day Care." The extensive publication covers:

- a description of the Colorado Training Project for Day Care Home Mothers
- the story of a Day Care Home Mother Trainee
- planning a training support system for Day Care Home Mothers
- implementing a Training Support System
- a resource appendix.

In Colorado the major thrust in early childhood development has been toward establishing day care centers; therefore, their manual concentrates on the day care home and day care home mothers. A day care home mother cares for other people's children in her home while the parents are working. The number in each home is from one to six, including the woman's own children. The children range in age from infancy to 12 years. The school-age youngsters are in the day care home before and after school and during school holidays and vacations. Many children remain during the summer.

The State Board of Education feels day care mothers need training and support, however, few training and support programs exist. To meet that need they have designed their publication for people who recognize community needs for day care home providers and who hopefully will establish programs. The experiences and ideas come from a three-year training project for day care home mothers in Colorado, and it is hoped this new information will serve as a springboard for many programs in the evolution of quality home day care.

Georgia

In 1971, Georgia's Governor, Jimmy Carter, established an Inter-Agency Task Force on Coordination For Early Childhood Development. By January, 1972, there was a state plan for a Comprehensive Early Childhood Development Program to serve 50,000 children from birth to age six. The plan called for the Legislature to appropriate $6-million to be used with existing expenditures to generate a $70-million a year program through more advantageous use of federal matching funds.

Through a contract between the Atlanta Public Schools and the state, the Cook Elementary School in Atlanta was chosen as the Training Center and became fully operational September, 1972, serving 157 infants through kindergarten. During the first six months, 27 staff members were trained. Two-thirds were welfare mothers who had never previously held jobs in the school system and many had no previous record of employment of any kind. None of the mothers dropped out of the program. The Cook Center program continues to be effective and it is felt the program is continuing to be successful because the mothers are experiencing an improvement in their own lives as well as seeing an improvement in their children.

The Pitts-Perry Homes Intervention Project (funded under Title IV-A) is a home-teaching program directly involving parents in teaching, observing, and recording their children's behavior (children have deficits in one or more developmental areas). Portage Project materials provide a checklist to assess 420 behaviors appropriate for the developmental level of children whose mental ages range from zero to five years and includes suggestions for developing each behavior. The parent involvement is total as they are trained to teach their own children, and the individual prescriptions written by paraprofessionals are administered by parents for their own children.

The Milton Avenue School Handicapped Youth Service Project, funded by The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, has been operational since January, 1974. Children accepted into the program are from 0 to 4 years of age and exhibit mild development delay or high risk. Educational diagnosis is done individually using developmental assessment devices in the areas of self-help, language, motor, cognitive, and social skills. Using the assessment results, an individualized curriculum is planned and implemented by the classroom teacher.

Children come daily for a half day program. They arrive for breakfast and go to a day care center or home after lunch. Teachers spend the other half of their day evaluating progress, writing objectives for the next day, and visiting individual parents in their homes. Each class of ten children is staffed with a master degree teacher from special education, early childhood or the interrelated field. A teacher aide with two years of child development training assists the teacher. In addition, an intern from Georgia State University and a teacher aide intern work in the classroom.

The parent training component puts a great deal of emphasis on nutrition, child development and behavior management. A parent trainer works with parents in these areas. She conducts workshops for the parents (at the school) and visits parents individually in the home. She takes magazines, toys, or educational materials to the home at each visit and demonstrates to the mother techniques which might be helpful in working with the child. Then the parent trainer video tapes the mother and child working together so that the parent can see her own success. A special Saturday workshop is held during the month for fathers.

The parent trainer also works with parents whose children are on the waiting list. They anticipate keeping a child in the program no longer than a year.

The Bethune Elementary School offers a program for children three to five years of age in speech and language development. An electronic wireless FM auditory system is installed in the special classroom enabling the teacher to communicate effectively with the pupils and to maintain a high level of mobility for both.

Hawaii

In 1973 the State of Hawaii, Department of Education, implemented A Curriculum Guide for Early Childhood. It was prepared to assist in designing educational programs for children between three and eight, with emphasis on ages three to five. Two major aspects of implementing an early childhood program are stressed by the Hawaii Department of Education. The first is to foster intellectual development without neglecting a child's socio-emotional and physical growth. The second is to implement individualization of education effectively so that the structure of the school organization, subject matter content, and instructional materials will provide the necessary flexibility which will promote children's individual learning and growth.

The curriculum guide compiled with numerous subsection authors, contributors of papers, reviewers, teachers, school administrators, and curriculum designers is comprehensive, containing 320-pages of material subdivided with colored, identified, plastic dividers. The message it conveys is to blend theory with experience to guide instructional practices.

Hawaiians in education feel the crucial significance of early childhood in the development of an individual has been pointed out from Plato to Bloom. Today, they continue to struggle to bridge the gap between theory and practice. That task is further complicated by such conceptual underpinnings as total child development and individualized education that support contempory theories of child development. Hence, curriculum for ECE must be multi-disciplinary in content and approach. Therefore, the Hawaii State Department of Education believes their curriculum guide is an attempt to build upon the best available knowledge and experience in child development in order to provide the practicing early childhood educator with specific guidelines for the instruction of the young.

Massachusetts

In Brookline, Massachusetts, the public schools have developed a model known as The Brookline Early Education Project, which could have nationwide implications for improving the quality of early education and for reducing educational handicaps. The program completed its first year October, 1973, and was initiated by Superintendent of Schools Robert Sperber. He believes if compensatory help for children who need it were to have a lasting effect it must start in the home--preferably at birth, or before.

In an effort to meet the needs of the total Brookline community, any resident expecting a child after March 1, 1973, has been declared eligible, with two conditions: the prospective parents must contact BEEP (Brookline Early Education Project) before the baby is born and they must have no immediate plans to leave the area in the next five years. In this manner, the earliest possible intervention and the longitudinal essence of the program is realized. No child progresses through the preschool years with an undetected educational or physical handicap. BEEP provides free health and developmental examinations beginning two weeks after the child is born. Following each examination, staff members review the child's pattern of development with the parents and send a report to the family pediatrician or health center.

BEEP does not accelerate or force children's development. Instead, its educational philosophy is oriented toward assisting the family in arranging an environment rich in resources and in opportunities for the child to exercise his natural talents.

The family may:

1. Call upon their specially assigned teacher for information or help
2. Drop in at the Center whenever they like, bringing along their children who will be cared for by trained staff in a specially

equipped playroom

3. Explore the materials about early childhood that BEEP has gathered together in its resource center
4. Borrow books, pamphlets and toys
5. View films and videotapes on child development topics and other aspects of childhood
6. Attend workshops on toy-making and listening to speakers from a variety of fields related to child development
7. Use BEEP's free transportation service to and from the Center
8. Learn about other resources for young children that exist in the Boston area--recreational, educational, and medical.

A detailed report, which included the diagnostic and educational program, family recruitment, outreach efforts, public response, significant accomplishments, and concerns for the coming year, and covering the first operational year was presented October, 1973. It is an ambitious report and the administrators prepared proposals to seek support for extending the present diagnostic and education services for children through to entry into kindergarten.

Minnesota

During the spring of 1974, the Social Services Division of the Department of Public Welfare contracted with Tri-Valley Opportunity Council of Crookston, Minnesota to provide day care services to the young children of the agricultural migrant workers who come into the state for work during the summer season. It was planned that the day care children were to come with older brothers and sisters to the public schools where Head Start and Title I programs were held. The public school coordinator was to serve as coordinator for all three of these separately funded programs. The school was to operate as a single unit but educational philosophy, curriculum and learning materials were planned for and purchased separately. The day care, Head Start, and Title I programs were planned for 12 different schools.

A purchase of service contract for $208,000 was negotiated between the Department of Public Welfare and Tri-Valley Opportunity Council. Of this amount $52,000 was a state appropriation to Social Services; the remaining $156,000 was the 75-percent Title IV-A match for reimbursement of these services. The contract was to purchase direct day care services for the children, educational curriculum and supplies, staff and administration costs. Of the $208,000 contractual agreement, approximately $183,000 was actually expended. This included $45,600 state appropriated dollars and $137,000 Title IV-A federal dollars. The cost of day care services averaged less than $10.00 per day. In the migrant day care program 730 infants, toddlers, and preschool children were actually served. The service went to children ages one month through five years, with more than eighty-percent being three year olds or younger.

The program will be expanded to meet the needs of approximately 1090 children for the summer of 1975. The day care curriculum will be revised with special emphasis on checking and/or adding specific migrant culture ideas, concerns and materials.

The State of Minnesota has new projects for children and parents funded with state money; six pilot projects provide a variety of services for children 0-5. The total funding is $250,000 and the intent of the legislation is to pilot some programs that the legislature will evaluate in considering state-wide funding through a foundation aid formula. There has been funding to the Department of Public Welfare for $800,000 of state funds for day care and nursery school programs for young children during 1974.

Missouri

Beginning school year 1973-74 every child in Missouri is guaranteed the right to an education appropriate to his needs. A task force is at work identifying the needs of children so that they may develop guidelines for early childhood screening in the State of Missouri. Three primary reasons for the process are: (1) to develop public awareness of the need for early identification and treatment of suspected physical, behavioral, and educational problems; (2) to assist parents and teachers in becoming more knowledgeable of the variability in early childhood development, and (3) to plan educational programs of a developmental nature for such children to be carried out at home, at school, and in the community, so as to enhance the child's capabilities.

Missouri has just issued a noteworthy manual (160 pages) covering "Special Education Services: Regulations, Standards and Procedural Guidelines," designed for children ages three through five, prepared by the Governor's Task Force to the Missouri State Department of Education, 1974. The contents take in procedures and resources for Follow Through; screening instruments, and program models. The task force feels an important aspect of the program is initial contact with the parent to involve them as fully as possible in the follow-up educational and developmental processes in the home, school, and community. For more than a year the people of Missouri worked on the development of this document. Fourteen public and professional meetings were conducted throughout the state with an impressive attendance — indicating there is a recognized need to assist school districts in providing services to the very young.

New Jersey

Union, New Jersey, has introduced "Pollution Control Education Center" -- a total classroom instruction program for grades one, two, and three. It has been designed to develop students' interest in the wise use and preservation of the biosphere and to give them an understanding of the threat that an industrialized society poses to the balance of the ecosystem. The materials for the course are published commercially for national distribution. In 1974 this program was endorsed for national dissemination by the Dissemination Review Panel of the U.S. Office of Education.

Union has completed its third year of developing a project to train the perceptual and analytical skills in early childhood education. The kindergarten and first grade materials have been designed and field tested and are now part of the curriculum in the public schools. The rationale is that our population is visually illiterate. Most people are not trained in the skills of seeing. They are unable to perceive fully what they see. Their vision is general rather than specific; thus they perceive only the obvious and usually miss the subtle nuances and relationships which define the uniqueness of an experience. Since awareness precedes learning, the lack of perceptual ability is a deterrent to learning. Project "SEE" is designed to offset this perceptual hiatus by developing in children the visual skills, and physical and mental discipline requisite to significant, meaningful learning. The essential element of the program is defined as the use of the prescribed instructional program in kindergarten or first grade at least three days per week. The program's adoption cost is only $20 for a set of instructional materials for one teacher!

Commissioner of Education Dr. Fred Burke, directed the Office of Program Development to outline programs that have been validated as successful, cost-effective, and exportable by the standards and guidelines of the U.S. Office of Education. The development and dissemination of these programs is carried out through funding from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III.

"Project Active" is designed for individualized physical activity programs for handicapped children. In 1974-75 two-hundred-fifty teachers will be trained in twelve sites located throughout New Jersey. Three regional workshops will prepare teachers to conduct physical activity programs for children with physical and mental disabilities. Nine mini-workshops will focus on two or three of the topics, e.g. prekindergarten screening, low motor ability, and low physical vitality.

A second successful program is called the "Right to Read" and is geared for kindergarten through grade three. As a result of community interest in Glassboro, New Jersey, an organization of parent volunteers was formed and they serve as classroom aides and reading tutors. Pretesting occurred in September, 1973, and post-testing in April, 1974; the average gain across all instructional levels was 1.52 years.

Two other early childhood education projects are: "Project Moppet", whereby teachers in Woodbridge, New Jersey, offer a comprehensive humanities program of poetry, creative drama, music, art, dance or movement, and film making, into the first, second, and third grade, and "Project Open Classroom" in Wayne, New Jersey, where an open curriculum choice permits students kindergarten through grade five to work in areas of their interest when and for the time they wish. It was introduced three years ago and is being maintained 1974-75.

"Project Child" is an innovative program conducted throughout New Jersey to determine the future educational needs of all preschoolers in the state. Information is gained in a house-to-house survey within school districts using a questionnaire designed to gain general information about preschool children from their parents. The project is federally funded, ESEA Title III, and is carried out with the cooperation of the State Department of Education and the County Superintendents.

This is the first project of its type conducted on such a large scale in New Jersey and one of the first such projects in the country. The Final Report was published September, 1974, but the initial request for the program came in early 1968. What started out to be a three year effort to survey preschool children in a small part of New Jersey became a chain reaction of requests throughout the state. By the school year 1971-72, additional funds were obtained for the extension of the project into the seven Northwestern counties of the State. By the school year 1972-73 the project extended into Central New Jersey. By the school year 1973-74, the project moved into the large and heavily urban Northeastern part of the State.

"Project Child," originally designed to screen 20,000 children, screened 125,000 boys and girls before it ended six years later. The State Department of Education has recommended to the legislature in a "Twenty Year Report on Special Education in New Jersey" that "Project Child" be refined and continued as an ongoing effort to support the preschool handicapped.

There are presently forty-five preschool facilities and programs functioning in New Jersey. These programs see upwards of 10,000 preschool handicapped children a year in their clinics, educational studies areas, and classrooms. Some of these children stay for a year. Others stay several years. Many make regular kindergarten. In 1973-74 a statewide training program for parents of preschool handicapped children was initiated by the State Department of Education through the State University of Rutgers. This program has been continued into the school year 1974-75.

South Carolina

Twenty-three Child Development Centers, which are located in 14 of the 92 school districts of South Carolina, are currently operating centers for three, four, and five-year-old children. During the 1973-74 school years these programs were supported with funds appropriated by the 1973 Legislature. The purposes of the project are two-fold:

1. To provide services for a limited number of children who require full-day supplemental care

The eligible family types are mothers, single parent families and guardians who are employed; mothers, single parent families and guardians who are enrolled in educational or job training programs, and parents or guardians who are temporarily incapacitated or for other urgent reasons unable to provide adequate care.

2. To provide experiences for both State Department of Education and school districts in the implementation of a child development program in the public school system.

This system will serve as a model for future programs when funds become available, and provide information related to financial feasibility, implementation procedures, availability of necessary resources, and coordination with state supported kindergarten programs.

The priority for operating a child development program will be given to the 14 school districts which operated programs during the previous year.

Texas

The Department of Community Affairs' Office of Early Childhood Development has started three new projects (1974): "Child Development Careers" is the first. As the demand for early childhood education increases in Texas, more people are becoming concerned about providing quality programs to care for young children. Texans feel the first requirement for a quality program is a competent staff, and this new project will examine the possibility of a coordinated approach to training child care givers in Texas.

The second new project is known as "Education for Parenthood," and plans are underway for a pilot project May 1975, to help parents learn about child development and sound family relationships.

The year 1975 will also see a project that could make it easier for a larger number of young children to be examined and tested for problems of abnormal development - the project called "Screening for Early Detection and Treatment of Problems."

Texas reports there are other early childhood education programs: "Preschool Program for Children With a Hearing Loss" (309 in 26 classrooms); "Program for Deaf-and-Blind"; "Comprehensive Special Education for Exceptional Children" (5562 by 289 teachers); "Bilingual Program" (7,360 in 350 classrooms) supported by Title VII funds; "Migrant Preschool Program" for five-year olds (3,020 in 84 school districts); "Child Migrant Preschool Program" for four-year olds (1820 in 88 classrooms); "Preschool Non-English Speaking Program" (1374 children); "School Breakfast Program" -- all children are eligible for participation in this program; "National School Lunch" and "Child Nutrition Program," where all children are eligible.

Wisconsin

There were 55 projects in Wisconsin in fiscal year 1973; eighteen were newly developed programs while 32 were on-going projects. Over 80-percent of the programs have been continued by state and local funds where there was termination of federal funding.

In 1973 there was a "New State in Indian Education." The goals of this project are to develop a curriculum that is acceptable to the Indian community and build a system of communication that leads to a mutual understanding of each others problems which results in renewed faith by the Indian community in its school system. When a final curriculum and communication system is approved by the Indian and general community, an operational proposal will be developed and written to put the program into effect.

Another new program is known as "A Systems Approach Model for Interfacing Environmental Education," and it is geared to children in kindergarten through grade three. Man, education, and environment are featured and the goals are: a) to improve environmental awareness, b) to improve understanding and involvement with expansion capabilities to other school districts.

The "Home Start Program" seeks to develop an effective model to introduce a learning environment for preschool children to be used in alternate delivery systems, media (cable TV), and personal contact (home visits). Parents of children attending inner-core elementary school are involved with teachers in the identification of pupil and community needs relative to preschool children, the investigation of existing models, and the adaptation of a selective model to immediate project target population.

HAPPE -- "Home Aid for Parents in Preschool Education" is also new in Wisconsin. HAPPE is a Title III project and focuses upon a preventative concept as related to early childhood health and development. The project stresses the importance of the parents' role in developing a home environment for children that will be conducive to the child's learning. One of the goals is to develop a screening program for infants and the very young child, thereby providing early detection of serious health and education handicaps.

An "Early Program for Gifted Children," that focuses on the practicality of a program for gifted children at the primary level is new. Special attention is given to disadvantaged children.

During 1973, 385 local school districts in Wisconsin used ESEA, Title I monies to fund programs for educationally disadvantaged children. These districts represent 88-percent of the 436 school districts. The count of children was:

Preschool	5024
Kindergarten	8081
First Grade	9360
Second Grade	8810
Third Grade	7889
	39164

In 1973 over 60 school districts used Title I funds to support a youth tutoring youth program. Several tutors were in the early elementary grades. One district used a preschool tutor and 20 kindergarten age tutors were reported by other districts. Over 80-percent of the children receiving tutoring services were in preschool through fourth grade. English, reading, mathematics, and kindergarten instruction were the phases most emphasized in 1973 projects in Wisconsin.

Responsibility for supervising Title I programs operated in institutions for neglected and delinquent children is shared by personnel within the Departments of Public Instruction and Health and Social Services.

WHY KINDERGARTEN?

In spite of a world-wide concern for young children and a persistent movement for enlargement and improvement of early childhood programs, there remain a number of educators and other citizens who question the validity of public kindergarten. This is difficult to understand since currently even infant and toddler programs are increasing significantly. New programs no longer address themselves to just an antipoverty thrust but are directed to all the children in the communities they serve. There is, indeed, abounding support for the notion that for many children, age five may be too late for truly successful educational intervention and experiences in the American culture.

Nationally, the importance of kindergarten is no longer questioned. The National Commission of the States, an organization of governors and early childhood professionals accepts the fact that current studies in child development, mental hygiene, family life and the psychology of learning confirm that children of five are ready for school.

The most recent research for example, done by the National Leadership Institute/Teacher Education: Early Childhood, is a ten month study of 53 active programs involving approximately 20,000 children from all kinds of communities. The major effectiveness of the programs was evidenced in the optimal physical development of the children, their social-emotional stability, the children's cognitive enrichment, parent training, health-care coordination and detection and intervention of high risk situations.

In short, all the programs researched were preventive, remedial, enrichment and service oriented and each was successful. Those of five and six years duration had statistical proof that the need for compensatory education became unnecessary if children were brought to school early enough and were given articulated, coordinated educational programs throughout grade three.

Of course, in answer to this there are always those who argue there is no significant difference by grade five between the performance of children with and without kindergarten. This argument has one fallacy. It fails to accept the fact that many children, especially high risk students, rarely keep pace with their peers unless they are provided with indepth early educational experiences.

Certainly, kindergartens cost money initially but once established they more than carry their own weight financially. Further, if one looks at cost effectiveness, few school programs bear as much fruit for monies expended as the kindergarten. Significantly too, many communities are using their new revenue sharing money to establish not only educational programs for fives but for infants and toddlers.

Louisiana was one of the pioneer states in the kindergarten movement. Kindergartens were instituted in the Orleans Parish Schools about 1882. In July 1945, the State Board of Education approved Standards for accrediting nursery schools and kindergartens. Beginning in the 1966 school year, State funds began to be distributed on a current year's basis rather than using the previous year's enrollment figures. As long as the previous year's enrollment figures were used, local school systems could not inaugurate a kindergarten program simply because they could not afford to carry the financial burden for a full year. State funds are available for public school kindergarten in the same way as for primary grades.

For the school year 1974-75 the kindergarten picture in Louisiana shows:

	Number of Schools with Kindergarten	Number of Children Enrolled	Number of Teachers
Public Schools	703	38,459	1,325
Non-Public Schools	109	3,418	124
Totals:	812	41,877	1,449

The comparison of the total number of children attending public school kindergarten from 1970 to 1974 is as follows:

1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
26,455	27,881	33,324	36,079	38,459

Over a period of many years, most of the public school districts in Michigan have provided preprimary education in the form of kindergarten classes for 4½ to 5-year-old boys and girls. In addition, a growing number of school districts have gradually extended these preschool offerings to include services to selected three and four year old children on the assumption that such services, in conjunction with kindergarten programs, would enable these children to be better prepared for the first and later gardes of elementary schools.

The Minimum Foundation Kindergarten Program marks the beginning of a comprehensive state-supported kindergarten program for all five-year-old children in Texas. Before 1970, kindergarten programs were entirely a matter of local discretion. In September, 1973, with the passage of House Bill 787, Legislature authorized a second and third phase in the kindergarten program. The second for educationally handicapped five-year-olds for either one semester of the school year or two semesters; this decision being left to local school districts. In addition, the bill authorized kindergarten for all other five-year-old children for one semester. The third phase will begin September, 1977, when the program will become fully operational. Although all five-year-old children have been eligible to attend kindergarten since 1973 attendance is not compulsory. However, it is mandatory that school districts offer the program which is state funded. In 1973 there were 80,134 pupils in an estimated 3200 classrooms.

The 1974 North Carolina General Assembly appropriated 27-million dollars for expansion of the statewide kindergarten effort. The appropriation will maintain the existing 696 classes at 23 pupils each, totaling approximately 16,000 five-year-olds. It will allow for the creation of 696 new kindergarten classes. The total number of state kindergarten classes operating during the 1974-75 school year accomodates 32,000 children. The kindergarten legislation also provides that a program for all five-year-olds in North Carolina will be available by September, 1978. This means that all school systems in North Carolina will be required to operate kindergartens; however, it leaves the option for parents to choose their church or private kindergarten for attendance. School attendance is not mandatory until the age of seven.

There is a State Kindergarten Program (Component IV - for Early Childhood Intervention-PRACHI) in seventeen different schools in Georgia. It is an intervention program for mildly to moderately handicapped kindergarten aged children. The staff consists of a certified teacher and an aide for each group of ten children, providing individualized instruction through the use of manipulative materials and specially designed equipment. Parental involvement begins with consent for the child's entry into the class and there is frequent home-school contact on pupils' adjustment and progress. The program's objective is to prepare children for the mainstream of school activities and experiences after overcoming or learning to cope with whatever handicaps may have impeded their progress. The children's involvement in these classes may be short or long term.

A new bill, which becomes effective July 1975, in Georgia includes the provision that a preschool program which will be at least on a one-half day basis for a 180-day school year shall be made available to all children who have attained age five and have not attained age six by September 1 of a fiscal year. This statewide program is to be implemented within the 1975-76 school year.

"Each school division shall provide kindergarten education for all eligible children whose parents wish them enrolled or be prepared to offer this program by September, 1976." (from Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia 1974-76, enacted by the General Assembly.)

The kindergarten enrollment in public schools:

1972-73 - 28,456
1973-74 - 53,866

Length of school day for kindergarten children in 1974:

Five Hours - 25,663
Three Hours - 28,203

At least 95-percent of the kindergarten teachers have a college degree with endorsement for kindergarten education. Twenty-six teacher training institutions offer programs leading to certification in kindergarten education in the State of Virginia.

Practically every school district in Alaska offers a kindergarten program. Kindergarten is not mandatory, but it is available for all children. The enrollment continues to increase each year, and Alaskans feel this is an indication there is a greater awareness of the educational potential which a young child possesses. The Alaska kindergartens vary and may be encompassed in an ungraded situation or in a self-contained classroom. The programs are in public schools and governed by the Alaska State Statutes, Bureau of Indian Affairs, or Alaska State-Operated Schools.

Public kindergarten programs are offered in every Delaware School District but no statewide curriculum exists. The Department of Public Instruction is attempting through its consultant role to encourage districts to develop kindergarten curricula that is integrated with primary programs.

All Massachusetts communities will provide kindergarten education for all eligible students by

September of 1975. At present 349 out of 351 cities and towns provide kindergarten education. However, the enrollment will decline sharply in the next ten years due to the decreasing birth rate. It is predicted that the funding pattern for ECE will also decline, offset by inflation factors.

Acts 83 and 143 of the 1973 Arkansas Legislature established the public kindergarten program and made $5,400,000 available for the 1973-74 school year. Approximately 14,000 children were served during this school year.

About half of Florida's School Districts now offer a full day kindergarten program. All other districts offer either half-day or double sessions for kindergarten students.

The State of Oregon has enacted new permissive kindergarten legislation authorizing school boards in districts of all sizes to implement such classes. Kindergartens there are for children in the year before first grade.

Prior to the passage of House Bill 85 in 1974, the State Department of Education in New Mexico provided no services for children under five years of age. For the past several years there have been some kindergarten programs for five-year-olds supported by Title I funds, and for the past two-years there have been state monies available for kindergarten programs. The number of children in kindergarten in the State of New Mexico increased from 2183 in 1969-70 to 7800 in 1973-74, and in the current school year has reached 9093 out of a potential population of approximately 20,000.

Each of West Virginia's fifty-five county school systems incorporates a program for five-year-old children as an integral part of its total education program. Financial support guarantees a program for each five-year-old child, and the number of children being served is increasing significantly (1975).

The enrollment in kindergarten in South Dakota is stabilizing due to the fact that approximately 90-percent of the eligible children (five years of age by October 31) are in kindergarten. Kindergarten is not compulsory. The funding has changed in South Dakota in that Title I was the primary source in the last five years, but now is putting very little money into kindergarten. State ADA allowance for enrollment, and use of local funds is primarily used now (1975).

The enrollment for kindergarten in the State of Washington -- which includes preschool handicapped students, has been as follows:

1972 - 49,109
1973 - 50,699
1974 - 55,652.

Washington has projected their enrollment through the year 1978, and figures indicate preschool and kindergarten will decrease by approximately 10,000 students over the year 1975.

The Department of Educational and Cultural Services in Maine has responsibility for children five-years of age and older. Kindergarten programs (for children five-years old before October 15) do not reflect the declining birthrate. In the fall of 1974, 17374 pupils entered public school kindergartens and

394 registered in private kindergartens. These figures are larger than those for the 1973-74 school year when only 16,584 children were enrolled in public school programs and 407 in private school programs.

Minnesota has legislation now that makes it mandatory for districts to provide kindergarten to children aged five, and in 1974 the Kentucky Legislature amended the school laws to require that instruction be offered to every child of compulsory school age.

One-third of the children in New Hampshire are in public kindergarten -- age five only. As of September, 1973, the ECE program in each school system in Maryland includes children ages five through eight.

At this time (1975) steps are being taken to develop a Kindergarten Curriculum Guide for the State of Indiana, and Illinois statutes do mandate local school districts to provide kindergarten to youngsters who reach age five by December 1st. These programs are not administered apart from the regular school program.

In considering the needs of ECE within the State of Wisconsin, the Department of Public Instruction Advisory Committee selected as one of its first priorities the development of curriculum materials. Their bulletin on Kindergarten presents general guidelines for program development and improvement, instead of being narrowly prescriptive. Today, more than 98-percent of the five-year-olds in the state attend a kindergarten. It was in 1973 that each school district was mandated to operate a kindergarten program. Twenty-six institutions, both public and private, provide certification for kindergarten teachers.

There is presently a five-year plan in South Carolina that states that at the end of five-years there will be a state supported kindergarten program for all five-year-old children. They are on the fourth year of that plan and over 50-percent of the five-year olds are registered in state supported kindergartens. There are 3,000 five-year olds registered in federally supported kindergartens and private kindergartens. A kindergarten unit has two half-day sessions and a child may attend either the forenoon or the afternoon sessions.

The South Carolina State Department of Education has adopted a five-year plan designed to reduce the percent of students repeating the first grade. They expect to reduce the statewide average of 15-percent to no more than 5-percent by the end of school year 1975. The learning center approach appears to offer the workable way to individualize instruction and provide continuous progress for young children. In 1973 the Department of Education published "Learning Centers Children Alive" and set forth the what, why, who, and how of learning centers. They also included how to begin and how to take it from there. The booklet, containing references and sources for materials, has been prepared with the hope it will provide practical suggestions for teachers who are searching for effective learning strategies for the very young students.

In the 70's the State of Arizona enacted legislation for the establishment of mandatory, state-supported kindergartens in all public school districts. As the districts took steps to establish kindergarten programs, to design minimum objectives for students, and to develop kindergarten curriculum guides, there was a strong voiced need for a general resource manual. In September, 1974, the Arizona Department of Education issued "A Supplementary Handbook for Kindergarten Teachers" -- an 8x11-inch ambitious manual of 120-pages devoted to:

- Arizona Laws and Regulations
- The Child (intellectual, social, emotional, physical characteristics; the Exceptional Child; suggested readings)
- The Teacher (facilitating learning, planning, record keeping, and assessment; suggested readings)
- The Parent
- The Curriculum (approaches, facilities, learning centers; suggested readings)
- Subject Areas
- Supplementary Resources
- Teacher Certification Requirements
- Appendix (progress reports, assessment, rating scale, goal-procedure, evaluation chart, teacher competencies).

The Division of Early Childhood Education of Pennsylvania, feels kindergarten is a somewhat unique but none the less integral part of the total program of education. The express purpose of the kindergarten is to recognize and to meet the individual and collective needs of the group insofar as possible. In 1974, the Kindergarten Guide for four and five-year-olds was revised by the ECE Division of Interdisciplinary Education. The presenters of the guide have attempted to provide sufficient activities to satisfy individual differences and have suggested experiences that contribute to the child's total growth. Its chief purpose is not to present a mandatory or finite course of study but to establish a broad base from which every teacher is free to move in the direction of his or her choice. The three basic purposes are:

1. Present a sound philosophy of kindergarten
2. Encourage a high level of teacher and child performance
3. Instigate a professional approach to all aspects of school life.

The writers say the kindergarten year IS important. It is a time when children's experiences may well determine the direction of their future education. It is a time when what happens to them can either stimulate or stifle their future eagerness for learning. The guide is complete with a preface, introduction, content page, and separate sections which cover: a) the home-school relationship, b) testing, c) curriculum, d) professional films, and e) a selected bibliography. The final section cites the kindergarten standards in Pennsylvania in various activities -- both formal and informal and planned. Pennsylvania educators support the notion that, for many children, age five may be too late for truly successful educational intervention and experience. Unquestionably, kindergarten has improved first grade success. One major city in Pennsylvania has found its two years of kindergarten for all fours and fives to be so effective in terms of first grade achievement that the district is now contemplating adding a citywide program for three-year-olds in the hope of improving the total well-being of their children.

Hawaii does not have a "kindergarten." In 1973 the Department of Education implemented their new curriculum guide for early childhood, and it provides a framework for educational programs for children between the ages of three to eight, with emphasis on ages three to five. The guide will be used to evaluate their early childhood programs.

In February, 1975, "Focus on Early Childhood Education" — a resource guide for the education of children ages three to six, was printed by the University of *Missouri* for their Department of Education.

In May, 1974, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in *Montana*, Dolores Colburg, Superintendent, published an impressive 314-page book entitled "Montana Kindergarten Handbook." This handbook is not prescriptive nor is it considered a finite course of study; rather, it was developed to establish a broad base from which every school district is free to move in the direction of its choice. The handbook suggests ideas, resources, materials, procedures and experiences to insure continuing excellent in the classroom. A special feature is the chapter titled "Indian Heritage Experiences" written by a group of persons representing Indian concerns.

Developers of the handbook drew on the experiences and materials of kindergarten programs in the other 49 states. An early childhood team of the Satellite Technology Demonstration researched and developed program materials. Many persons with creative talents contributed to the production and melded to make what seems to be a useful initial version reference. The table of contents covers the learner age three years through eight in characteristics, environment, insuring learner success, Indian heritage experiences, learning experiences (creative, social, physical, intellectual), children's literature and sources of information.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction acknowledges in the handbook that although most kindergartens admit children on the basis of chronological age, it is possible that the children within a single classroom could range in developmental ages from three to eight years over the span of a kindergarten year. Further, developmental ages will vary greatly within the individual child. Since a child grows and develops a great deal in a nine month period, he has different needs educationally as he passes from one developmental age to another.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION ISSUES

Certain things are happening now that will affect us in the year 2000. The birth rate is down. People are living longer. What has this to do with early childhood education? Youngsters in school today, or children born today, are the ones that eventually will be faced with the older population in the year 2000. How can they expect to participate in the development of the gross national product to such a large extent? How will they meet the needs of society? This being the case, it is critical that we stop and take inventory and reevaluate priorities -- and find out about our investment in these children. If there are going to be fewer people, they'd better be good.

In August 1974, Senator Walter Mondale and Representative John Brademas introduced a comprehensive child-development bill into the Senate and House. It was reintroduced in the current session of Congress (1975). Their new program entitled "The Child and Family Services Act of 1975" is the latest in a long history of efforts to provide federal aid to ECE and day care.

Some observers have speculated that the unwillingness or inability of this country to establish a comprehensive public program can be explained by the failure of a powerful unified constituency to emerge from the multiplicity of groups that now populate the day care and early childhood field. Others say it is because of the conflicting social and political values which surround issues as institutional care vs. home care; private vs. public sponsorship; the role of the family--particularly the mother--in raising children; the identification of day care with "welfare mothers" and work incentives; and the degree to which programs for young children should be considered educational.

An impressive development favoring possible expansion of early childhood programs and day care is the growth in the number of working women who have children in need of such services. The Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor estimates that nearly 26-million children under 18-years old had mothers who were working or looking for work in March, 1972. More than 5.5-million of these children were under six years old. "Windows on Day Care," a report by Mary Dublin Keyserling, based on findings of the National Council of Jewish Women, adds many other groups of children to its estimates of those in need of day care: Two-and-a half million children under six whose mothers do not work but are from families in poverty; handicapped children; children of mothers who are students or are in work-training programs; and children of families who simply want sound educational day care.

William Pierce, Director of Policy Development for the Child Welfare League of America, has estimated that even though the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare claims that about 1.3 million children are receiving some sort of preschool day care, about 600,000 of these "child care years" are provided under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. The number of those getting anything more than custodial service is probably closer to 300,000. Another half million are enrolled in Head Start, which does incorporate some educational components in its program.

At the time these estimates were made in 1974, Pierce also suggested that the number of children under six of working parents or of parents who would like to work was at least seven million. The gap between those preschoolers getting service and those whose parents may want it comes to an overwhelming six million children. And these estimates do not even take into account the day care needs of school aged youngsters.

A recent report "Review of Child Care Services Provided Under Title IV, Social Security Act" published by HEW found that of 552 centers and private homes in nine states, funded under Title IV, 425 did not meet minimum health and safety requirements. More than a third did not meet child-staff-ratio requirements. One of the conclusions of this report points to the problem of fragmentation that permeates the day care and early childhood field. Authors of the report suggest that one of the reasons for poor administration of this program is the confusion over which agency directs its different aspects--the Social and Rehabilitation Service or the Office of Child Development.

The picture which now exists has some contradictions. On the one side is a list of social circumstances pointing to expanded day care and early childhood education and a large body of research showing the importance of the early years to intellectual development. On the other side are the inadequacies of ECE programs and day care services in terms of availability, standards, and staff qualifications.

In trying to determine what is emerging in early childhood education and day care today, one is impressed with the overlapping federal legislation and state-federal jurisdictional lines. There are approximately 60 federal programs that contribute to the funding of early childhood and day care programs. The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor has listed them in a 90-page pamphlet called "Federal Funds for Day Care Projects." The largest share of day care and ECE funds comes under the legislative authorities of the Social Security Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They are administered by divisions of HEW, the Office of Child Development, the Social and Rehabilitation Service, and the Office of Education.

MAJOR SOURCES OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR DAY CARE
1974

Social Security Act

Program	Administering Agency
Aid to Dependent Children	Social & Rehabilitation Service (HEW)
Work Incentive Program (job training & day care for welfare recipients)	Social & Rehabilitation Service (HEW)
Child Welfare Service	Social & Rehabilitation Service (HEW)

Economic Opportunity Act

Head Start	Office of Child Development (HEW)
Parent & Child Centers (comprehensive services to children under 3)	Office of Child Development (HEW)
Migrant & Seasonal Farm Workers (day care services to migrant farm families)	Community Services Administration (HEW)

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Title I (public school preschool programs; may coordinate with Head Start to add educational component)	Office of Education (HEW)
Migrant Program (education of migrant children)	Office of Education (HEW)
Follow Through	Office of Education (HEW)

Manpower Development and Training Act

Concentrated Employment (day care services to facilitate employability)	Prime Sponsor
New Careers (day care services to those training for jobs)	Manpower Administration
Neighborhood Youth Corps (assignment of youth as day care aides)	Manpower Administration, Bureau of Work Training

In an essay found in Pamela Roby's book, Child Care-Who Cares?, Virginia Kerr comments perceptively on the meaning of this situation:

> ....day care continues to suffer as an institution in search of a reliable professional constituency. One does not have to go far today to find a social worker or an early childhood educator who will comment on the need for more and better day care, and at the same time deprecate the use of day care by women who do not have to work. Without such a constituency the success of efforts to lobby for expansion of day care at local, state, and federal levels is contingent on the ability of its advocates to effect working conditions among professionals and agencies competing for control of programs and among community and social reform groups who often balk at any signs of compromise to their particular philosophies of care...[1]

The creation of the Office of Child Development in 1970 was for the purpose of coordinating children's programs. However, it could not administer all the programs. Some educators feel the problems of fragmented legislative authority backed up by a fragmented constituency remained to hamper its efforts.

There are some substantive reasons why the day care and early childhood field is in disarray--reasons that have to be dealt with before a real child-advocacy coalition can be built. It is not sufficient to suggest that everyone get together. There are disagreements related to the purpose and the quality of the programs that are worth exposing and arguing about.

---

[1] Roby, Pamela (ed.), Child-Care-Who Cares?, New York, Basic Books, 1973.

The idea that day care should be educational is relatively new, and is by no means universally accepted. Even in the 1960's, when the work of Bloom and others pointed to the importance of a child's early experiences to his intellectual development, day care was regarded as custodial care. These notions exist even today. The Bloom-type theories seemed reasonable to parents and they enrolled their children in preschool programs. Day care remained in a category by itself.

The one apparent exception was Head Start, funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. Though Head Start marks the beginning of a willingness to think about day care in terms of educational programs, the divided thinking which categorizes day care as custodial, and preschool and kindergarten programs as educational still exists.

Because of its importance in the lives of children, one can imagine day care becoming a bold instrument of social policy. In fact, day care has not made policy; it has followed along when policy has been made. It has grown somewhat haphazardly, changing its own definition every ten years. At present, it does not know whether it should serve the child, the parent, or the family. It cannot make up its mind whether it is a service for families with social pathology or for all families, whether it should be limited to children from underprivileged families or be offered to all children, whether it wants to change children or preserve cultural styles from one generation to the next. It does not know where to obtain its official identity. The confusion can be seen in state licensing patterns. The Welfare Department handles licensing in most states, the Health Department in others, and some different agency or combination of agencies in the remainder. The Department of Education is the licensing body in a few states, although it shares the task with Welfare in one other and makes recommendations in many.

It is precisely in this area of planning for our children, except in the grossest sense, that we are timid in this country. With our tradition of valuing rugged individualism, we have been reluctant to say much about the kinds of children we want. Do we want obedient children? Adaptive children? Happy children? Children who remain faithful to the values of their families? Group oriented children? Eventual adults who can slip from one type to another? Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner has commented on the extent to which child rearing in the U.S.S.R. has a clear objective to train children as responsible citizens of the Soviet State, in contrast to the lack of objectives and belief in autonomy in the United States. In our concern for individuality, we occasionally find license for evasion of the responsibility for guidance.

Bettye M. Caldwell[2] asserts that what the day care field needs in order to be a powerful instrument of social policy is a forum from which to advertise its potential and a willingness to proclaim its importance. She feels the forum ought to be public education--albeit education defined more flexibly and comprehensively than it is today. There is little justification for a conceptual separation between public education and public day care, for they believe that most schools are "day schools" and represent "day education" with or without the supportive family services offered under the rubric of day care. They are talking about a conceptual model for program design rather than about professional auspices for program orientation. The same suggestion has been made by Florence Ruderman[3]:

---

[2] Caldwell, Bettye M., "Day Care: A Timid Giant Grows Bolder," National Elementary Principal, 51:74-78; September 1972.

> Day care, regardless of the auspices under which it is offered, should be developed as a child-care program: a program directed to optimum social and psychological health of the young child whose mother cannot care for him for some part of the day... But a given family's need for social casework or other forms of help should no more define day care, nor determine eligibility for it, than the existence of social service departments in schools and hospitals now defines these facilities as social work services. For organized child-care service in this country to develop and meet adequately a growing social need, it must be recognized as a positive social institution and enabled to stand in its own right as an essential child-care program.

---

[3] Ruderman, Florence, Child Care and Working Mothers, Washington, D.C., National Education Association of The United States, September 1971.

Public education would do well to stop and reflect occasionally that one of its concerns should be with the care and protection of the children who come within its sphere of influence.

When we are embarking on a nationwide program of social intervention offered through comprehensive child care, we let ourselves prattle about such things as cost per child, physical facilities, or even community control. And when we begin to think big about what kinds of children we want to have in the next generation, about which human characteristics will stand them in good stead in a world changing so rapidly, we fall back on generalities such as care and protection. Yet, any social institution that can shape behavior and help instill values and competencies and lifestyles should also shape policy. Early child care is a powerful instrument for influencing patterns of development and the quality of life for children and adults. Because of its power, those who give it direction must not think or act with timidity.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION 1974-75 SCHOOL YEAR

State	Under B.P.I.*	Other	1974-75 Assessing Needs
Alabama	X		X
Alaska	X		
Arizona	X		
Arkansas	X		
California	X		
Colorado	X		
Delaware	X		
Florida	X		
Georgia	X		
Hawaii	X		
Idaho		Office of Child Development (ECE not in public schools)	
Illinois	X		
Indiana	X		X
Iowa	X		
Kansas	X	and Depts. of Health & Social and Rehabilitation Services	
Kentucky	X		
Louisiana	X	(Head Start or day care centers not under B.P.I.)	

State	Under B.P.I.	Other	1974-75 Assessing Needs
Maine		Dept. Educational & Cultural Services: 5 years & older Dept. Health & Welfare Division of Social Services: nursery school programs and day care centers	
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts	X		
Michigan	X	and Dept. Social Services for licensing all prekindergarten programs (public and non-public)	
Minnesota		services for 0-8 shared responsibilities among 4 state agencies	
Mississippi		(1973 established Child Development Office)	X
Missouri	X		X
Montana	X		
Nebraska		(except for Head Start and a few day care centers preschools are private operations)	
Nevada	X		
New Hampshire	X		
New Jersey	X		
New Mexico	X		

State	Under B.P.I.	Other	1974-75 Assessing Needs
New York		Bureau of Child Development & Parent Education	X
North Carolina	X		X
North Dakota	X	Head Start, Day Care under Director of Day Care Services, State Social Services Board	
Ohio			X
Oklahoma		Office of Child Development Washington, D.C.	X
Oregon	X	(not responsible for Day Care, Head Start or other social services programs)	
Pennsylvania	X		
Rhode Island	X	plus nursery schools for ages 3-6 are operated on a private basis with B.P.I. approval mandated	
		Day Care centers licensed by State Dept. Social & Rehabilitative Services	
South Carolina	X		
South Dakota	X		
Tennessee	X		

State	Under B.P.I.	Other	1974-75 Assessing Needs
Texas		Dept. of Community Affairs, Office of Early Childhood Development + State Dept. of Public Welfare	
Utah	X	and State Office of Child Development	X
Vermont	X		
Virginia	X		
Washington	X	and responsible for K-12 in public schools & 1-12 in non-public schools	
West Virginia	X		
Wisconsin	X	(does not define ECE; has kindergarten for 5-year olds; programs for children with exceptional needs at age 3. Supervises educational programs for exceptional children in all state or county residential facilities)	X
Wyoming	X		

*Board of Public Instruction

CURRENT TRENDS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The current trends in ECE are the growing involvement of educators; early childhood programs of health, educational, diagnostic services, and parental involvement; newsletters and other publications to share ideas and activities with other states and reports on the crucial needs of young children. All of these trends are a strong indication of the states' concern for ECE and a realization of the need for sharing expertise in making assessments and evaluations.

Parental Involvement

A controversial trend in ECE is the growing involvement of educators in the direction of the family. Although parents are still to be found in the school, there is increasing emphasis on early intervention--that is, on educators going into the home to teach the mother how to enhance her child's development. Educators also target younger children, including infants, for preschool education. Some research findings supported the idea that homebased parental support is more beneficial for the preschooler than an institutional environment.

One school based ECE program, the Model Early Childhood Learning Program in Baltimore, Maryland, stresses the development of cognitive ability, and claims to have raised the IQ's of some 500 disadvantaged children 16 points through the use of individualized tape-recorded instruction. The program, which received more than three-million-dollars in ESEA Title III funds during its first three years, rests on the mastery of 269 cognitive objectives, that is, operations that a child must know in order to read, write, and figure well. Dozens of minilessons were designed, and a casette tape with instructions was made up for each. Every child receives a daily "prescription for learning" from his teacher, and follows the appropriate lesson on the tape until he feels comfortable with the material. Some lessons are taught to groups of children by either the teacher, a teaching assistant, or a parent; however, the emphasis is on one to one instruction. Each class of 20 pupils has one master teacher, two teaching assistants, and one parent; all go through an identical six week training program. Another primarily school based program, the Brookline Early Education Project in Massachusetts, extends the scope of the preschool program in that it aims to provide health as well as educational services from birth until kindergarten age. The program, initially funded under a planning grant of $161,000 received two-year operational grants totaling $750,000 from the Carnegie Corporation and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to offer services to 225 children -- from birth to 24 months and their parents (beginning March 31, 1973). In the school, diagnostic services and education programs for parents and children are provided. The staff also works with parents in the home, designing educational activities and attempting to foster an environment conducive to the child's development. The emphasis is on prevention and identification of physical or psychological impairments rather than on acceleration of development.

Parental involvement has evolved in some cases to mean 'the school in the home' rather than 'the parent in the school'. Parent education activities, primarily aimed at training mothers in the science of child-rearing, have raised considerable controversy among some parents and educators. As woman's traditional role of mother and homemaker has become less clearly defined, and as some researchers have concluded that the home is preferable to any institution for educating the young child, some mothers have turned away from notions of maternal instinct in raising their offspring and have sought educator created techniques to promote child development during the preschool years.

The trend toward home based ECE programs that center on the parent are praised by educators, citing research which suggests that equal educational opportunity cannot be provided solely by the schools. They urge that education be more comprehensive, influencing the child from birth onward in the home and community and through the mass media. It is felt that educators should come into the home to train parents and join with them in supporting the child's extra academic schooling.

On the other hand, a Waterloo, Iowa, early childhood program has also been criticized for interfering too much in the family sphere. The Waterloo Home Start program (which accomodated 170 two-year olds in September, 1973) provides weekly home visits by a trained aide, who brings toys and offers advice to the child's mother on how she can further the child's development. A social worker also assesses the family's needs and details the community services available. After two years the child is enrolled in a Waterloo preschool.

Television series and home curricula intended to help parents educate their children are also being increasingly developed. For example, Fred Rogers of "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" has launched work on a parent education television series, and the Nassau County (Long Island, N.Y.) school board has designed two pilot programs for a parent directed, child oriented TV series entitled "Room to Grow." The Nassau County Board of Cooperative Education Services also distributes a do-it-yourself home curriculum called "While You're At It," which features 200 small cards showing parents how to make toys and in other ways work the child's education into their daily schedule.

The controversy over who can better educate young children, the parent or the school--and more generally, over how valuable early childhood programs really are--sparked a considerable amount of research in 1973 and 1974. One study, "The California Report: Early School for All?" suggested that very young children are more apt to be hurt than helped when they are removed from the home setting. The study concluded (1) that a child's ability to use his intelligence depends on other skills--his affective sense, his neurological development, and his auditory and visual senses, (2) that these skills develop at different ages in different children and that generally a child's central nervous system is incomplete until he is seven to ten years old, (3) that a warm continuous mother-child relationship is a more important determinant of a child's emotional health than is the socioeconomic level, and (4) that starting a child in a formal education program before the child is emotionally and physically ready could cause both psychological and physiological harm. The authors of the study were trying to assess the merits of early childhood programs through systematic evaluation of a California task force proposal to provide formal education programs for all three-year-old and four-year-old children.

In 1973 the Parent-Child Development Center in Birmingham, Alabama, expanded its pilot program on infant-mother relationships in poverty circumstances with the aid of a twelve month $513,227 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The thrust of the program is to improve the quality of the mother's influence on her baby from the age of six months. The Center will attempt to increase the mother's self esteem and confidence, thereby maximizing her constructive influence and will stress social and language development as well as the quality of home life.

Other research showed that a depriving environment did not have life long stunting effects. After three years of observing middle class American children and those children born and raised in impoverished rural villages in Guatemala, Jerome Kagan of Harvard University has concluded that retardation caused by early deprivation is reversible. Guatemalan children who had no toys and did not play or talk with their mothers were found to be severely retarded by American standards; however, 11-year olds in the village, presumably raised the same way, were found to be active, alert, and apparently intelligent.

Federal Involvement

Despite the new emphasis by some educators on keeping young children in the home, millions of parents continue to seek day care facilities for their children, in some cases out of necessity; one-third of all mothers in the United States with children under six, a total of 4.5 million women, are jobholders.

Federal aid to day care programs serving 411,000 children totaled 397-million-dollars in 1973. In addition, under the Work Incentive Program (WIN) free day care for children of welfare mothers is provided as part of an effort to prepare such women to enter the work force and leave the welfare roles. However, the quality of the WIN day care centers has been widely criticized and in April 1973, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare proposed new regulations limiting the time for which free care will be provided to the training period and the first three months after a woman begins working. The regulations were adopted. In April, 1973, HEW announced a new fee schedule for the Head Start program. A family of four must have an income of $4300 or less in order for the children to be enrolled free of cost.

In March, 1973, the Office of Child Development awarded five grants totaling $320,000 to be used to train more than 180 adults to become child development associates (CDA's). The year before the OCD has instituted the CDA program and granted $800,000 to a consortium to develop and issue credentials to qualified CDA candidates. Credentials in the CDA system will be in several areas of competency, including ability to encourage the child's social, emotional, and intellectual growth; ability to stimulate language development; and understanding of the child's health and educational needs.

States' Involvement

In the spring of 1974, a landmark piece of legislation known as the Children's Budget sailed through the Massachusetts Legislature with only minor cuts in requested funds for day care, community based care, residential care, and special area budgets for local Councils for Children and Mental Health and Retardation Area Board. The bill effective July 1, 1974, provided 19-million-dollars for children's services throughout the state.

In a separate appropriation, the Legislature granted 26-million-dollars to help school districts meet the demands of the state's Special Education Act. The Act effective September, 1974, requires all local school districts to be responsible for the education of every child between the ages of 3 and 21 who has special needs of any kind -- including the truant child, the severely retarded four-year old and the academically capable child who is physically handicapped. The initial 26-million-dollars is to be used primarily to hire the necessary skilled personnel, to establish a core evaluation team (a school psychologist or school nurse, a social worker, a special education teacher and parents) in each school district to develop an education plan for the district, and to facilitate the implementation of the plans according to the districts' various needs and priorities. It is reasonable to believe the work of the Office for Children, created just two years before, was in part responsible for the passing of the Children's Budget in 1974.

If ECE is to take hold to the degree advocated by its strong proponents, where are the money and the push to come from? Until a short time ago, anybody would have answered the federal government. But then came the clampdown on federal spending for social and educational programs. It appears clear now that the big impetus in early childhood education in the years immediately ahead must come from the states.

In the school year 1973-74 the picture changed. Reapportionment brought a new breed of younger, brighter, more aware individuals representing urban and suburban areas into the state legislatures. Governors are more progressive and concerned about national issues than they have ever been. State commissioners of education are innovative and perhaps more committed to the concept of accountability than their predecessors; many have been convinced that the early childhood years should be given priority. Many go on record of supporting ECE on the covers and in the preface and introductory statement of the brand new ECE materials for curriculum, guidelines, position papers, and manuals.

As of early 1975, seventeen states had established child development offices: Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia. Some were established by legislation, some by executive order and some by informal gubernatorial action; Alaska, California, Georgia and Utah, had acted to place centralized authority for child development activities in their state education departments.

Governor Calvin L. Rampton of Utah is convinced that "child development services should be closely tied to and should influence elementary education." He also sees the need for coordination among all the separate state agencies that administer or operate child development services. In his own State, the governor and State Superintendent of Public Instruction have jointly initiated an Office of Early Childhood Development to be located in the State Board of Education. How will this affect what the office does? They feel even though leadership is vested with the state board, education will be only one facet of the total. Other agencies will continue to provide other services -- the Division of Family Services, Division of Health, Division of Mental Health, and others -- each delivering the service it can best provide.

In the Appalachian border state, West Virginia, poverty is endemic. Its impact is felt heavily by the public schools. According to a report of the state's Interagency Council for Child Development Services, large numbers of children whose genetic potential is wholly adequate are found, upon their entrance to school at the age of six or seven, to be functioning in the range of borderline mental retardation or below. The same children, in shockingly large numbers, are nearly edentulous (toothless) by this age through the ravages of inadequate diet, poor dental hygiene, lack of proper medical attention and neglect. West Virginia, under the leadership and prodding of a committee governor, Arch A. Moore Jr., is moving resolutely into early childhood development. The legislature mandated programs for five-year-olds by the 1973-74 school year and voted to permit programs for children below five years of age. Over a period of two years the lawmakers appropriated $10.5 million to get these early childhood programs underway.

A comprehensive state plan for child development services was submitted to the Appalachian Regional Commission for funding, and funds were made available to start a program. School year 1972-73 was the first year of operation, with much of the program focused on a seven-county region in central West Virginia that was totally lacking in child development services.

The Appalachian Region may prove to the rest of the U.S. that the way to meet the needs of preschool children is through state cooperation and regional implementation. That was one of the thrusts of the Consortium of State Department of Education in the Region, set up in May, 1973, with funds provided by the National Institute of Education. Their approach to ECE is built around three components: daily half-hour television lessons, weekly home visits by paraprofessionals who meet with each child and his parents, and weekly group sessions that may be conducted in mobile classrooms. September, 1974 was the target date for initiating the ECE approach consortium-wide. This approach can reach three and four-year olds as well as five-year olds in areas without formally established kindergartens.

There is an infinite variety of approaches to ECE as America enlarges its committment to the idea that getting a child ready for school may be more important than school itself.

A recent survey by the Michigan Department of Education revealed that $40 million were being distributed to a variety of preprimary programs in Michigan, exclusive of state aid funds for kindergarten programs. The Michigan State Board of Education has encouraged preschool education when it can be shown that such experiences contribute to the fullest development of each child's abilities and insure maximal opportunity for success during the child's years in the public schools. On the other hand, the State Board of Education (1974) does not view publicly-financed and formalized prekindergarten education as being necessary for all children. The Michigan Department of Education believes the acquisition of basic readiness skills is an essential goal for preprimary education and that most children should be able to acquire the basic readiness skills necessary for success in the primary grades as a result of their parental teachings, sibling associations, neighborhood environment, and their kindergarten experiences.

Included in the 1973 Department of Education budget was $100,000 for the development of objective-referenced tests to be administered to all children upon their entry into first grade. This action was predicated on the belief that such an educational assessment would provide better clues to parents, teachers, and other school personnel for ensuring that ECE programs are better tailored to meet the individual differences for all young children in Michigan, but especially for those children who have been identified as having experienced difficulty in acquiring the basic skills for them to succeed in the elementary schools.

The State Board of Education approved preprimary performance objectives as another step toward implementation of an effective ECE accountability system. The performance objectives offer a composite of three categories of objectives in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains which are related to minimal first-grade entry level skills for children in Michigan schools. The State Commission on Preschool Performance Objectives included educators from the university level, supervisors and administrators of public schools, directors of infant nursery programs, consultants from the Department of Mental Health, and coordinators of elementary curriculum. The State Commission on Kindergarten Performance Objectives was composed of classroom teachers, a school board member, a school supervisor, and parents. The report was labeled "Experimental Edition 1974". The participation by the Commission and the scope of initial recommended performance objectives for ECE indicates real interest in early childhood development programs. In February, 1975, the Preprimary Performance Objectives began a two-year revision. In 1973, Act 116, P.A. gave the

Michigan Department of Social Services authority to license all prekindergarten programs, both public and non-public.

Many of the new district programs focus on whether we can bring children to the elementary grades considerably better prepared for any form of education that follows, with fewer needs for special education and with higher levels of achievement. There is a change in implementation all across the country -- perhaps not a general change but it is indeed a noticeable one, in that the first order of business in education is to take the first and most fundamental educational system - the family - and help it to do the best possible job. The current American system of education does nothing to prepare people to be parents.

Publication Trend

There is a trend, these past few years, to share and to include workable solutions to the problems of implementing ECE in individual states. Four state offices - Alaska, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and North Carolina publish newsletters concerning their activities so that interested persons may keep up to date about what is going on in other places. A recent statewide "Conference on the Young Years" in Missouri attracted 850 people, including the Governor, state legislators and members of the State Board of Education, and apropos - the Department of Education has recently released a resource guide for children ages three to six. Titled "Focus on Early Childhood Education" it can be obtained from P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, Missouri, without cost.

There are other useful and helpful publications put out by Departments of Education in the United States regarding ECE. Hawaii has a new, carefully developed extensive Curriculum Guide for ECE that may be purchased at cost. The trend to share, and to contribute, is also illustrated through the new child care library in Illinois opened by the Office of Child Development as a resource for day care and child welfare personnel. The library serves the needs of administrators, staff, and parents from 700 day care centers in the greater Chicago area. It is also available to child care and child welfare professionals. The library welcomes (1) contributing samples of recent agency publications and reprints, (2) back issues of materials, and (3) placing the library on mailing and subscription lists for free newsletters, periodicals and other materials. The library is located on 1459 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Several of the other states are publishing reports on the needs of young children and are available from the various regional Office of Early Childhood Development. The reprint, "Texans' Concerns for Young Children" is a 100-page report that may be requested from Early Childhood Development, P.O. Box 13166, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas. A copy of the report, "Early Childhood Education: First Annual Evaluation Report" is available at cost. It may be secured at the State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California.

Georgia has a recent publication available on request titled "Good Things Are Happening" and is an attractively designed publication which presents basic information briefly and succinctly for ECE. It can be found at Georgia Appalachian Child Care Project, 618 Ponce deLeon Avenue, Atlanta, Georgia.

Another recent publication of note is "The State of Young Children in North Carolina: A Compilation of Needs and Services, 1974". The report concerns crucial needs of young children and lists services available in each of the state's 100 counties. It, too, is available upon request from Box 12405, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Special Education-Mainstreaming Concept

A trend that appears to be emerging is that administrators of special education are beginning to reorder their priorities and allocate large proportions of the funds available to them to the identification of early programming for young handicapped children. They are beginning to more fully recognize that the young years are the "payoff" years.

Special education, as is true of all education, is being held more and more accountable for programs. New programs that are developing will be expected to show results if support is to be obtained and maintained. Thus, ongoing evaluation is a must in order to produce the data necessary to convey the worth of a program.

There is a firm belief among those who have been involved in and are committed to early education of the handicapped that all handicapped children can function at a higher level if appropriate intervention is provided in the early years, preferably as early as infancy. Research data back up this point of view. Some handicapping conditions can be alleviated, other handicapping conditions can be overcome to a large extent, and still others can be helped to better compensate the child who can then make fuller use of his potentials even though he may continue to need special education in later years. Family involvement is a real plus for early identification and educational programming for the young child. There is no doubt that professionals from the various disciplines are ready for a fuller committment from federal, state, and local governments to help the young child develop to the fullest.

Mainstreaming, defined as the special education of educable mentally retarded and other mentally and physically handicapped pupils in regular classes, is an emerging trend on the national scene. A policy statement adopted at the 1973 Annual Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children begins:

> The system of organization and administration developed for special education should be linked with regular education (a) to increase the capability of the total system to make more flexible responses to changes in the behavior of individual pupils and to changing conditions in schools and society (b) to permit all elements of the system to influence the policies and programs of each other.

The idea is not new--for many years some educable mentally retarded youngsters have joined other children for physical education, music, art, and in the older age groups, home economics and shop classes. Some crippled, partially sighted, hard of hearing, or otherwise physically handicapped children have also been accommodated in regular classrooms. Typically, handicapped children who are being mainstreamed report to regular classroom teachers instead of to their separate "special education" classes. They leave the main group only for essential small-group or individual instruction, educational assessment, and for picking up and delivering assignments prepared by the special education teacher.

But mainstreaming carries the concept of one school system for all children much further. In many districts large numbers of handicapped children are being moved from special schools and self-contained special education classrooms into regular classes. There, in the company of children from their own neighborhoods, they receive special education for as much of the school day as possible.

In conventionally organized schools, the special education teacher has a headquarters or resource room to which pupils can go from their assigned mainstream rooms. In "open" schools, the special education teacher may be a member of the teaching team working in the open setting or he may have a special headquarters room.

Several factors have helped to bring about the current, more widespread acceptance of mainstreaming as a means of maximizing the social and educational benefits schools can offer all children. One of the most important is recognition of the fact that labeling certain children as retarded, disturbed, or handicapped influences the way others--both pupils and teachers--treat these special students. Integration of special education into the regular classroom eliminates the need for labeling and removes some of its undesirable effects.

Jack W. Birch, professor of education at the University of Pittsburg, in the manuscript "Retarded Pupils in the Mainstream" also points to recent court decisions affirming the rights of handicapped children to full and free education as a factor tending to accelerate mainstreaming. He cites a growing trend to question the fairness, accuracy, and appropriateness of using psychological testing as the sole criterion for placement in special classes or schools. At a time when comparative research findings have rarely showed academic or social advantages for handicapped children in special classes as compared to handicapped children who remained in regular classes without special help, there seem to be few good arguments for maintaining the status quo of a separate educational system for special education. In schools where mainstreaming has been introduced, responsibility for planning programs, schedules, and assignments for mainstreamed pupils is shared by special education and regular teachers, However, sharing does not end with programming for handicapped youngsters placed in regular classrooms. Special education teachers also assist regular class teachers by providing educational assessments and plans for individualized programs and by helping to teach other non-special education pupils who may need help in specific areas of study.

Despite the advantages for children, mainstreaming is sometimes difficult for teachers who are used to the separation of special education and regular students. Special inservice courses are being offered, and mainstreaming is introduced slowly. Additional professionally trained help, i.e., speech therapists, counselors, psychologists, visiting teachers, and educational diagnosticians are also provided. The most effective force for successful mainstreaming in six U.S. school systems has been positive teacher attitudes. Readiness of special education and regular class teachers to cooperate with each other, belief in the right to education for all children, willingness to share competencies as a team, openness to include parents and other professional colleagues in planning for and working with children, and flexibility with respect to class size and teaching assignments all seem to be basic to maintaining one educational system for all children.

SUMMARY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Like the beginning learner, ECE is also in its infancy. Its direction is uncertain despite much prompting and expressed advocacy. The multitude of ECE programs currently underway faces difficult challenges. High operating costs, a lack of solid federal support, arguments that preschool youngsters are not physically or mentally prepared for education, and a belief by some that ECE will lead to the possible destruction of the American family are among the criticisms voiced.

Major Sources of Current Problems

Findings suggest that many of the problems from which the major early childhood education programs are currently suffering result from poor planning and inadequate administrative procedures at both the federal and the state levels of government. Another group of problems can be traced to a lack of initiative in seizing available options for developing comprehensive services addressed to the different needs of children. It is possible, of course, that poor procedures and lack of innovation are rooted in turn in more fundamental difficulties which have to do with prevailing negative attitudes concerning the need of improved and expanded child services.

The State Level

In many states there are major state agencies with extensive programmatic involvement with children. Each of these agencies has divided the state into different administrative regions. Local representatives for each region rarely meet with their counterparts from other agencies. Programs and problems are approached with an exclusive agency perspective. Little thought is given to program and service coordination and inter-agency cooperation. This is true both at the local level where services are rendered and at the state level where programs are planned and evaluated.

The Federal Level

The situation is not better at the federal level. Too many agencies are involved in running too large a number of different programs, many of them not large enough to have a decisive impact. Departments, even parts of departments, are unwilling or incapable of coordinating design, oversight, and funding of child-related programs. The difficulty is compounded by a lack of information on the part of federal administrators about the real conditions at the local service level. Lessons to be learned from previous failures seem to have little impact. The federal government has yet to issue a clear statement defining its policy with respect to the care, development, and quality of life of children. While the utilization of Title IV-A funds on the part of some states and cities provided an opportunity to offer comprehensive services to an increasing number of children, federal policy has made almost impossible the expansion of Title IV-A budgets and activities.

Projection for ECE

A basic assumption underlying the implementation of ECE can be stated as follows: existing programs and services, authorized and funded by Congress, can be improved by action of the executive branches of government. Eventually, new legislation will be needed to more firmly establish a comprehensive national effort for children 0-8 years of age. However, much progress in this direction can be made in the meantime on the basis of existing legislation. By rethinking rules and regulations, by aggressively making use of federal funding opportunities and committing the required state matching funds, by consistently developing administrative mechanisms for bringing together services intended for the same client population, and by interfacing child care and child development programs with social services provided for other age groups and functional needs--considerable headway can be made toward the development of integrated services that meet the several needs of young children.

The Real Needs of Children

Referred to above are the persistent negative attitudes about the need and desirability of services to children beyond and above the service and care they traditionally receive in their families and later in school. Another comment needs to be addressed to the great need to educate the American people about the real needs of children. Unless the population at large understands what is at stake, no lasting improvement can be expected. It needs to be explained, imaginatively and over and over again, that society pays an exorbitant price, economically and in human terms, for poor child care that does not meet the children's needs. Children raised in unsafe and substandard housing, or inadequate diets, with improper medical care, without opportunities for growing with their peers in an emotionally and intellectually stimulating environment, without a chance for reaching their potential, by necessity become social liabilities for whom medical, educational, and social rehabilitation is extremely costly. Further, they represent priceless human potential that is wasted and individual lives that are thwarted. Children must be viewed as human beings with a full range of human needs, and as a unique group of people whose special needs have to be met while they are inarticulate and powerless. It is people, at all stages of life, who must be seen as the focus of our social services policy.

APPENDIX A

DIRECTORY OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Dr. LeRoy Brown
State Superintendent of Education
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Marshall L. Lind, Commissioner
Alaska Department of Education
Early Childhood Education
Pouch F
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Beatrice H. Bates
Early Childhood Education Specialist
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

A. W. Ford, Director
The Office of Early Childhood Planning
Room 505 Baptist Medical Arts Building
12th and Marshall
Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

Wilson Riles
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Calvin M. Frazier
Commissioner of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203

Kenneth C. Madden
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Townsend Building
Dover, Delaware 19901

Ralph Turlington
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Department of Education
Capitol Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Jack P. Nix
State Superintendent of Schools
Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Genevieve T. Okinaga
State Program Specialist
Early Childhood Education
Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

D. F. Engelking
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Office Building
Boise, Idaho 83702

Michael J. Bakalis
Superintendent of Public Instruction
302 State Office Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Catherine Haynes
Early Childhood Consultant
Department of Public Instruction
120 West Market Street - 10th Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dr. Robert D. Benton
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

C. Taylor Whittier
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol Building
Topeka, Kansas 66601

Dr. Lyman V. Ginger
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Louis J. Michot
State Superintendent
Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Carroll R. McGary
Commissioner of Education
Department of Educational and Cultural Services
Education Building
Augusta, Maine 04330

James A. Sensenbaugh
State Superintendent of Schools
Department of Education
P.O. Box 8717, BWI Airport
Baltimore, Maryland 21240

Gregory R. Anrig
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

John W. Porter
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan 48902

Corinna Moncada, Coordinator
Early Childhood Education
Capitol Square
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Ralph Brewer, Director
Division of Instruction
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Mildred Winter, Director
Early Childhood Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Dolores Colburg
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Helena, Montana 59601

Dr. Stan Carlson, Director
Pre School Education
State Department of Education
233 South 10th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Georgia A. Hastings, Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dr. Cynthia Mowles, Consultant
Early Childhood Education
New Hampshire Department of Education
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Anne R. Tantum, Director
Administration and Supervision
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Education
P.O. Box 2019
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Leonard J. DeLayo
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sante Fe, New Mexico 87501

Kathryn Sue Updike, Associate
Early Childhood Education
Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

J. W. Jenkins, Director
Kindergarten - Early Childhood Education
Department of Public Instruction
State of North Carolina
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

M. F. Peterson
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Gene Wenger, Supervisor
Early Childhood Education
Department of Education
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Office of Community Affairs and Planning
4901 North Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
Attention: Shirley Collier George

Jean Spaulding, Specialist
Early Childhood Education
942 Lancaster Drive, N. E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

Charlotte G. Garman
Senior Program Advisor
Early Childhood Education
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Arthur R. F[illegible]arell, Acting Commissioner
Commission of Education
199 Promenade Street
Providence, Rhose Island 02908

Early Childhood Education Supervisor
Elementary Education Section
State Department of Education
803 Rutledge Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Jean Gore, Consultant
Early Childhood Education
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
State Capitol Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

William W. Locks, Director
Elementary Education
Division of School System Management and Planning
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Diann Cowling McKee
Planning Specialist
Office of Early Childhood Development
P.O. Box 13166
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Walter D. Talbot
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Department of Education
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Robert M. Witney
Commissioner of Education
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Grey W. Ritchie
Supervisor of Kindergarten
Division of Elementary Education
State Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Dr. Frank B. Brouillet
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

Jean Benish
Early Childhood Education
West Virginia Department of Education
Building 6, Room 318
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

State Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Robert G. Schrader
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
State Office Building West
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alabama State Department of Education. Alabama Guide for Kindergarten Teachers. Montgomery, Alabama: State Department of Education, 1970.

__________. Early Childhood Education Teacher Aide Guide. Montgomery, Alabama: State Department of Education, 1974.

__________. Policies For Early Childhood Education. Montgomery, Alabama: State Department of Education, 1974.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Achieving The Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, February, 1974.

Arizona Department of Education. Follow Through - A Parent-Implemented Project. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

__________. Kindergarten In Arizona. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education, September, 1974.

__________. Ochoa Follow Through. Sponsored by University of Arizona, College of Education. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arkansas Department of Education. A Comprehensive Early Childhood Plan For Arkansas. Prepared by The Office of Early Childhood Planning. Little Rock, Arkansas: Arkansas Department of Education, March, 1974.

________. Summary of Needs. Prepared by the Office of Early Childhood Planning. Little Rock, Arkansas: Arkansas Department of Education.

Auerbach, Stevanna. "Federally Sponsored Child Care". Child Care-Who Cares? New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Boughey, Arthur S. Ecology of Population. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1968.

Brookline Early Education Project. The Brookline Program for Infants and Their Families. Brookline, Massachusetts: Brookline Early Education Project, October, 1973.

Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services. A Twenty Year Report. Trenton, New Jersey: State Department of Education, September, 1974.

Caldwell, Bettye M. "Day Care: A Timid Giant Grows Bolder." National Elementary Principal, September, 1971.

California State Department of Education. Early Childhood Education. Prepared under the direction of the Early Childhood Education Program for Early Childhood Education. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1974.

________. Early Childhood Education, First Annual Evaluation Report 1973-74. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1974.

________. The Early Childhood Proposal. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1972.

________. Policies for Early Childhood Education. Prepared under the direction of H. Glenn Davis, Program Manager Early Childhood Education. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1973.

Child Development Policy Research Project. Child Development Policy for Texas. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1973.

Colorado Department of Education. Developing Training Support Systems for Home Day Care. Denver, Colorado: Mile High Child Care Association, June, 1973.

Colorado State Department of Social Services. Minimum Rules & Regulations for Child Care Centers. Denver, Colorado: Colorado State Department of Social Services, August, 1973.

Comba, Trudy. Curriculum Guide For Kindergarten. Boise, Idaho: State Department of Education, 1973.

Day Care and Child Development Council of America. Voice for Children. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, January, 1975.

Day Care Consultation Service. Money For Day Care Programs in Connecticut: A Report About How State and Federal Day Care Funds Are Administered. New York: The Day Care Consultation Service, June, 1972.

Department of Education. Educational Programs That Work. Trenton, New Jersey: Department of Education, 1974.

________. Guidelines For Proposals For Early Childhood Education Programs. Charleston, West Virginia: Department of Education.

________. A Resource Guide for Exploration of Child Care Guidance and Service Occupations. Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education-Home Economics, October, 1973.

Department of Public Instruction. Annual Evaluation Report - Programs for Children in Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children. Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Public Instruction, 1974.

Department of Public Welfare. Family Day Care and Group Family Day Care Standards. St. Paul, Minnesota: State of Minnesota Department of Public Welfare, October, 1973.

________. Standards For Group-Day-Care of Preschool and School-Age Children. St. Paul, Minnesota: State of Minnesota Department of Public Welfare, December, 1973.

Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services. About Children - Services Directory. Little Rock, Arkansas: Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services, 1974.

Department of Social Services. Rules and Regulations Governing Group Day Care Centers. Honolulu, Hawaii: Department of Social Services, April, 1966.

Division of Elementary Education. Kindergarten Education in Virginia. Richmond, Virginia: State Department of Education, 1974.

Division of Special Education. Questions and Answers on 766. Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Department of Education, 1973.

Early Childhood Institute. Early Childhood Commentary. Athens, Ohio: College of Education, 1974.

Education Commission of the States. Early Childhood Programs: A State Survey. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, October, 1974.

Educational Improvement Center. Project Child. A final report sponsored by Margate City Board of Education and New Jersey State Department of Education. Pitman, New Jersey: Educational Improvement Center, 1974.

Employment Standards Administration. Day Care Facts. Pamphlet 16 (Rev.). Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.

Georgia Department of Human Resources. Rules of Georgia Department of Human Resources. Atlanta, Georgia: DOAS Printing Services, 1974.

Goodlad, John I., Klein, M. Frances, and Novotney, Jerrold M. Early Schooling in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1973.

Hoffman, M.S. Early Indications of Learning Problems. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Academy, 1972.

Horton, Katrena (ed.). Child Care In Appalachian North Carolina: A Regional Approach. North Carolina: Office of Child Development, 1975.

Hunter, Madeline. "Public Education for Four-Year-Olds: To Be or Not To Be." Childhood Education, May, 1973.

Idaho Office of Child Development. Growing Up In Idaho: The Needs of Young Children. Boise, Idaho: Office of Child Development, 1974.

Johnston, Bernard (ed.). Education Yearbook 1973-74. New York: MacMillan Educational Corporation, 1973.

Jordan, June B. (ed.). Not All Little Wagons Are Red. Arlington, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Kansas State Department of Education. Bulletin 501 Early Childhood. Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Department of Education, 1975.

Karnes, Merle B. (ed.). An Evaluation of A Summer Training Program For Teachers of Young Handicapped Children. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, August, 1974.

Karnes, M.B., Teska, J.A., and Hodgins, A.S. "The Successful Implementation of a Highly Specific Pre-school Instructional Program by Paraprofessional Teachers." The Journal of Special Education, 4, 1970.

Keyserling, Mary Dublin. "Windows on Day Care." National Council of Jewish Women, 1972.

Klein, Jenny W. "Toward Competency in Child Care." *Educational Leadership*, October, 1973.

Langham, Barbara. *46 Things You Need to Know About Texas Children*. Austin, Texas: Office of Early Childhood Development, November, 1974.

Lazar, Joyce B. and Chapman, Judith E. *The Present Status and Future Research Needs of Programs to Develop Parenting Skills*. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, April, 1972.

Maryland State Department of Education. *Guidelines For Early Childhood Education*. Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland State Department of Education, September, 1973.

McLure, William P., Pence, Audra May. *Early Childhood and Basic Elementary Education*. Illinois: Board of Trustees of The University of Illinois, 1970.

Meier, John. *Screening And Assessment of Young Children at Developmental Risk*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, DHEW Publication No. (OS) 73-90, 1973.

Michigan Department of Education. *The Common Goals of Education*. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, September, 1971.

________. *A Position Statement on Educational Accountability*. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, March, 1972.

________. *Recommended Performance Objectives for Early Childhood Readiness Development Programs in Michigan*. (Experimental Edition) Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education, 1974.

________. *Student Performance Expectations*. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education.

Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Focus on Early Childhood Education.* Columbia, Missouri: College of Education, University of Missouri, February, 1975.

_________. *Special Education Services.* Jefferson City, Missouri: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1974.

Missouri State Department of Education. *Guidelines For An Early Childhood Screening Program.* Jefferson City, Missouri: State Department of Education, 1973.

National Association For the Education of Young Children. *Some Ways of Distinguishing A Good Early Childhood Program.* Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1974.

National Society for The Study of Education. *Early Childhood Education.* 71st Yearbook, Part 2. Edited by Ira J. Gordon. Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

New Jersey Office of Program Development. Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation/Field Services. *Educational Programs That Work - 1974-75 Edition.* Trenton, New Jersey: Department of Education, September, 1974.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. *Kindergarten-Early Childhood Education (K-3).* Prepared by the Division of Kindergarten-Early Childhood Education. Raleigh, North Carolina: Department of Public Instruction, 1974.

Office of Community Affairs and Planning. *A Survey of Early Childhood Development Activities in Oklahoma and A Proposed Plan For The Establishment of an Oklahoma State Office of Early Childhood Development.* Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Office of Community Affairs and Planning, August, 1973.

Office of Instructional Services. *A Curriculum Guide for Early Childhood Education*. State of Hawaii: Office of Library Services/Teacher Assist Center, 1972.

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Montana Kindergarten Handbook*. Helena, Montana: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, May, 1974.

__________. *Early Childhood Intervention in Illinois*. Prepared by Program Assessment and Evaluation Unit. Springfield, Illinois: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, March, 1974 (2nd ed.).

Parker, Ronald K. (ed.). *The Preschool In Action: Exploring Early Childhood Programs*. New York: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Parker, Ronald K., Knitzer, Jane. *Day Care & Preschool Services: Trends & Issues*. Atlanta, Georgia: Atavar Press, 1973.

Penick, George, Jr. (ed.). *The State of Young Children in North Carolina: A Compilation of Needs and Services*. North Carolina: Office of Child Development, May, 1974.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. *Kindergarten Guide*. Prepared by Charlotte G. Garman, Early Childhood Education for the Bureau of Curriculum Services. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1974.

Roby, Pamela (ed.). *Child Care-Who Cares?* New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Rosser, John (ed.). *Instructions for Conducting Project Child Survey*. Developed by the Educational Improvement Center. Pitman, New Jersey: Educational Improvement Center.

Ruderman, Florence. *Child Care and Working Mothers*. Quoted in "Principal," Volume LI. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association of the United States, September, 1971.

Schmidt, Velma E. *Early Childhood Education*. Columbia, South Carolina: State Department of Education, 1972.

Schrag, Howard L. *Status of Young Children In The State of Idaho 1974*. Volume II. A Report submitted to The State Economic Office and to The Office of Child Development, Region X, DHEW.

________. *The Status of Minority Children In Idaho 1974*. Volume III. A Report submitted as required to the Western Interstate Commission For Higher Education and to The State Economic Opportunity Office, June, 1974.

Scott, Rudeen, Fugua, Pamela, and Schrag, Howard. *The Prenatal, Perinantal, and Postnatal Status of Children in Idaho, 1973*. Boise, Idaho: Office of Child Development.

South Carolina Department of Education. *Child Development Model - 1974-75*. Columbia, South Carolina: State Department of Education.

________. *Learning Centers Children Alive*. Columbia, South Carolina: South Carolina State Department of Education, 1973.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. *Bilingual Early Childhood*. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

State Board of Education. *Kindergarten-Early Childhood Education Standards, Policies and Guidelines 1974-75*. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Board of Education, 1975.

State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. *Kansas State Board of Health Regulations for Child Care Centers for Children*. Prepared by the Division of Maternal and Child Health of the State Department of Health. Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Department of Health, January, 1974.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Early Childhood Education Workshops*. Springfield, Illinois: Superintendent of Public Instruction.

________. Guidelines for House Bill 322/323 - Early Childhood Education for Handicapped Children. Springfield, Illinois: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1973.

________. Statewide Report on Title VI, Part B Regional Projects, Fiscal Year 1973. Springfield, Illinois: Superintendent of Public Instruction.

________. Suggested Sample Schedules Early Intervention and Enrichment Experiences. Springfield, Illinois: Superintendent of Public Instruction, May, 1972.

________. Building Foundations for Educational Change. Madison, Wisconsin: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1974.

Texas Department of Community Affairs. Office of Early Childhood Development. Early Childhood Development in Texas: 1973-74. Austin, Texas: Texas Department of Community Affairs, 1974.

________. Summary Report: Regional Forums on Early Childhood Development in Texas. Austin, Texas: Texas Department of Community Affairs, 1973.

________. "Survey of Licensed Child Care Facilities in Texas," Austin, Texas: 1973. (unpublished)

Texas Education Agency. A Guide For The Education of Five Year Old Children in Texas. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, Bulletin 696, 1970.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Child Development Associate Training Information Series Number 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974.

________. The Children and Youth Projects. Prepared for Health Services and Mental Health Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Rockville, Maryland. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July, 1972.

________. Early Childhood Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, 1972.

________. Rescuing Abused & Neglected Children. Reprinted by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, Children's Bureau with permission from the Christian Science Monitor. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974.

Utah State Office of Child Development. Annual Report Utah State Office of Child Development. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Board of Education, July, 1974.

Waugh, Kenneth W., Bush, Wilma Jo. Diagnosing Learning Disorders. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971.

Western Federal Regional Council. Day-Care Center - Resource Allocation System. San Francisco, California: Census use study--Cloud 9.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Annual Evaluation Title I - E.S.E.A. Madison, Wisconsin: Division of Instructional Services, 1974.

________. Kindergarten - Experiences in Living and Learning. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1971.

Women's Bureau. Day Care Facts. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.